

RACE AND CIVILIZATION

By
FRIEDRICH HERTZ
D.Ec.

Translated by
A. S. LEVETUS and W. ENTZ

LONDON
KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRUBNER & CO., LTD.
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN CO.
1928

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
STEPHEN AUSTIN AND SONS, LTD., HERTFORD.

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
	ABBREVIATIONS	vii
	PREFACE	ix
I.	RACE HATRED AND THEORIES OF RACE	1
	Race Theory, the Evaluation of Races, and Race Instinct	2
	Aristotle's Justification of Slavery	4
	The Privileges of Aristocracy Justified	4
	The Origin of the Aryan Creed	6
	Belief in Race and Nationalism in France	7
	Belief in Race in England	8
	Belief in Race in Germany	10
	Race Hatred in America	12
	Race Hatred, World Trade, and World Peace	13
	Race Theory and Science	14
	Notes to Chapter I	18
II.	THE PHYSICAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE RACES OF MANKIND IN RELATION TO THEIR MENTAL LIFE	20
	The Term "Race"	20
	The Problem	21
	Unity of the Human Race—Primitive Forms	22
	Origin and Variation of Race Characteristics	24
	Skull Formation	28
	Facial Bones	32
	Facial Features	33
	Brain	35
	Colour of Skin, Hair, and Eyes	38
	The Illusion of Pure Racial Types: Racial Mingling	41
	Notes to Chapter II	44
III.	RACE AND PSYCHOLOGY	48
	Instinct and Reason: Mental Heredity	50
	Inherited Tendencies or Environment	52
	Caste; Nobility	54
	Genius, Heredity, and Environment	55
	The Conceptions of Race Character	56
	Qualitative Race Differences	57
	Distributive Race Character	60
	The Temperament Doctrine	60
	Evolution and Tradition	63

CHAP.	PAGE
Is Race Antipathy a Natural Law ?	66
Race Hatred and World History	68
Notes to Chapter III	71
IV. RACE AND LANGUAGE IN HISTORY	75
The Indo-European Problem	75
Migrations and Crossings in Ancient Times	77
War as a Factor in Race Mixing and the Forming of Nations	80
Language no Test of Race	84
Relationship between the Aryan and other Language Families	89
Languages and Cultural Value	91
Notes to Chapter IV	96
V. NORDICS, ARYANS, AND OTHER ELEMENTS IN EUROPE . . .	100
Prehistoric Connexions	100
Present Distribution of Races	102
The Nordic Type in Germany	103
Nordic Type and Ancient Classic Culture	106
The Pre-Aryans in Greece	109
The Ligurians	112
The Etruscans	112
The Iberians	115
The Finns and Magyars	115
Non-Aryan Features in Europe	116
Genius and Race	121
Notes to Chapter V	125
VI. THE PROBLEM OF RACE MIXING	129
Effects of Racial Crossings	129
The Racial Compound of the Jews	133
Notes to Chapter VI	136
VII. RACE MINGLING AND DECAY OF NATIONS	137
The Fall of Rome	137
Social Reasons for the Rise and Decline of Rome . .	144
The Decay of Greece	147
The French Revolution	151
Race Mixture and Cultural Development	152
Notes to Chapter VII	156
VIII. THE MODERN RACE THEORIES	159
Gobineau's Theory	159
The Anthro-Sociological School	163
The Race Theory of H. S. Chamberlain	166

CHAP.	PAGE
The Race Theories of Eugen Fischer, Hans Guenther, and F. Lenz	172
Some American Race Theories: Lothrop Stoddard, Madison Grant, W. McDougall	180
Notes to Chapter VIII	187
IX. RELIGIOUS LIFE OF THE ARYANS AND SEMITES	189
• Social Foundations of Aryans and Semites	190
• Monotheism and Polytheism	191
• Social Foundations of Israel	193
• Religious and Moral Evolution of Israel	195
• Christianity and Judaism	204
• Comparison between "Aryan" and "Semite" • Religiosity	205
• Religious Evolution of India	210
• Buddhism	213
• Tolerance	215
• Judaism and the Church	221
• Notes to Chapter IX	223
X. ARYAN AND SEMITIC CIVILIZATION	228
• Constitution of the Family	228
• Economics	230
• Evolution of Right and Law	233
• Human Rights among Semites and Aryans	235
• Parallel Development of Right and Law among all • Races	239
• Foundations of Formation of States	240
• Notes to Chapter X	242
XI. ON RACIAL CAPACITY FOR PROGRESS	245
• Character of Primitive Races	245
• The Negro Question in America	250
• Former Barbarism of Aryan Peoples and its Relics in • Europe	253
• Backward Races	259
• Non-Aryan Civilizations	259
• Unity of Human Spirit	261
• Notes to Chapter XI	267
XII. ON THE ALLEGED "RACIAL CHARACTER" OF THE • TEUTONS	271
• Parallels of Character of Primitive Peoples	271
• Teutonic Fidelity	272
• Entrance of the Teutons in History	277
• Freedom and Political Talent	286
• The Position of Women	287
• Killing the Aged	288

CHAP.		PAGE
	Contempt of Work, War, Drinking, Robbery . . .	289
	Religion	290
	Notes to Chapter XII	294
XIII.	GENERAL PRECONDITIONS FOR CULTURAL PROGRESS .	298
	Physical Preconditions for Cultural Progress . . .	300
	Historic Prerequisites for Progress of Culture . .	305
	Notes to Chapter XIII	309
XIV.	PSYCHOLOGY AND ETHICS OF THE RACE THEORIES .	310
	Race Theory and Struggle for Life	310
	Race and Democracy	312
	The Influence of the Race Theories on Thought . .	313
	The Ethics of the Race Dogma	319
	Racial Instinct and National Feeling	320
	Race Dogma and Individuality	323
	Notes to Chapter XIV	326

ABBREVIATIONS

- AA.* = *Archiv für Anthropologie.*
Kbl. = *Korrespondenzblatt der deutschen Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte.*
JAI. = *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland.*
ZE. = *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie.*
Anth. = *Anthropos, internationale Zeitschrift für Völker- und Sprachkunde.*
ARG. = *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie.*
MWAG. = *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien.*
ZA. = *Zentralblatt für Anthropologie.*
ZMA. = *Zeitschrift für Morphologie und Anthropologie.*
JAPh. = *Journal of Anatomy and Physiology.*
BSAP. = *Bulletin et memoires de la société d'anthropologie, Paris.*
VBG. = *Verhandlungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte.*
PAR. = *Politisch-anthropologische Revue.*
GS. = *Grundriss der Sozialökonomik.*
HVPs. = *Handbuch der vergleichenden Psychologie, published by G. Kafka, 3 vols., 1922.*

PREFACE

SEVERAL critics of this book believe that I deny any correlation between race and mentality. I wish, therefore, to state once more that I do not assert definitely the absolute mental equality of all races; nor can the opposite be demonstrated convincingly. What history and ethnology seem to teach is that the fundamental traits are the same in all races, and that the adaptability of individuals of one race to social and cultural conditions created by other races is not limited by inherited qualities. But probably there is at least a diversity of temperament between certain races and even small differences may sometimes have great consequences. However, those theories, which try to explain almost everything by temperament, seem completely superseded to-day.

Another tenet of all race theories is that race mixing may be followed by disastrous consequences. For this view also, no evidence whatever has proved conclusive.

My book has also been objected to as exaggerating the influence of environment, but I do not at all think that environment is all powerful, nor do I emphasize hereditary transmission of acquired characteristics. This latter theory I even hold to be very improbable, at least in the usual form, though the question is not yet definitely settled, and, moreover, has no great importance for the subject of this book. Generally, environment only offers certain opportunities, and it depends on the historical level and the cultural individuality of a people how it is used, though, of course, opportunity may be a very strong factor. Much depends also on the influence of individual leaders. But this influence is mainly traceable in the formation of nations, not in that of races, with which this book is exclusively concerned.

The theory of the great racial superiority of the "Nordics" and of their rôle as the sole creators of all civilization first assumed political importance as the gospel of the Pan-Germans, as worked out by H. S. Chamberlain. It has become one of the most powerful ideologies in modern Germany, and its part in the mentality leading to the Great War is indisputable. Now, however, some of the nations

who were adversaries of Germany in the War seem to become more and more infected by the unfortunate product of Pan-German arrogance themselves. Even where the antagonism between peoples is more of an economic or social origin, it becomes hopelessly aggravated and embittered by the introduction of race theories asserting the natural right of one race to dominate others, or to restrict by force their possibilities of existence. Thus racial questions have become the greatest of all dangers to the peace and the civilization of the world.

VIENNA, 1928.

RACE AND CIVILIZATION

CHAPTER I

RACE HATRED AND THEORIES OF RACE

ONE of the most deplorable phenomena of recent years has been the growth of the separative instincts among men. The extraordinary development of trade and traffic throughout the world has reduced the spatial and mental distances between the most widely separated peoples. In place of these, however, have appeared deep gulfs between neighbours and even between constituent parts of the same people. All nations have become more and more bound together in a world-economy and a world-culture; the idea of permanent peace and organizations of all kinds striving to bring nations together have spread widely. In strange contrast to all this we find a return to economic and political isolation, and a recrudescence of hatred against everything foreign or different from the native type. Two powerful movements of our time—nationalism and socialism—emphasize the feeling of community, and yet at the same time racial hatred arrives to disrupt national and social unity.

Our whole thinking is dominated by evolutionary ideas; we cannot escape the sense of relationship connecting all living beings—an attitude for which scientific research in many fields offers the most convincing reasons, and through which a new religious sentiment is growing up. Science and contemplation demonstrate more and more the fact that nowhere are there hard and fast lines of demarcation, that everything is in a state of endless becoming, and that even the line between living and dead has grown uncertain.

In sharpest contrast to this is the doctrine, so often preached, that within the human race, indeed even within nations, there exist unbridgeable abysses, and that the differences between races are so powerful as to be insurmountable. Race has become a political slogan. Pan-Slavism and Pan-Germanism have played a fateful part in history, and already we are hearing of Pan-Islamism and a Pan-African race movement.

It is not difficult to see the close connexion between the race argument and national antagonism; and yet the most superficial glance shows that nation and race are by no means identical. Many nations are indeed quite chance groupings; they have sometimes split off from their nearest blood relations, while the mingling of various stocks has also played a part in their development, along with conquest, dynastic marriages, and inheritances, and other similar factors. In spite of this, however, all nations like to cherish two illusions: that they are of pure blood, and that racial differences are very deep-seated. In nationalistic ideology almost everywhere belief in race is a dominant factor. Its emergence has caused that intensification of national antagonism which has become such a danger to our civilization.

RACE THEORY, THE EVALUATION OF RACES, AND RACE INSTINCT

In this book we shall confine our attention to those theories of race which set out to establish, scientifically, the degree of innate value of various peoples, and to deduce the whole movement of history from "Race". In such theories the result is usually clear from the start, namely the glorification of one's own stock, and the extenuation of the deeds of oppression and exploitation of others. We certainly do not oppose the statement that there are or may be racial differences, we do not "deny that races exist", as the favourite phrase of certain people puts it. What we do oppose as a degradation of true science is the clothing of mere greed and the brutal lust of domination in the garments of scientific terminology.

The chief content of race theories, in this sense, is the assumption that the differences between peoples and even certain differences within a people are as deep-seated as they are enduring. One's own race is considered noble, the source of all culture, the pioneer of all progress. All other races, on the other hand, are inferior, less gifted, morally ignoble. Not all the power of civilizing tendencies, of economic development, or of education, can avail to enable the ignoble races to free themselves from this inferiority. At best such peoples can only copy superficially the example of a higher race: a real cultural elevation would demand a change in the physical basis of life, and could only be achieved by extensive intermingling. This would, however, take place at the expense of the higher race, which would be dragged down precisely as much as the lower race rose. Very often it is even assumed that every mingling of races only leads to the combination in the product of all the bad qualities of both sides. Further it is asserted that race feeling (meaning,

in practice, racial arrogance and hatred) has been implanted in man by nature, and that every dilution or obliteration of natural antagonism must be rejected.

In all this there is nothing true except that race-hatred is a very ancient phenomenon. Yet it is not so much founded on a real racial instinct as on mistrust and dislike of all foreigners, no matter to what race they belong—a feeling which always develops under certain primitive conditions of life. Indeed, this feeling is a relic of barbarous times. It has remained for our "culture" to perform the service of dressing up this atavistic survival in scientific tinsel.

One capital error of race theories is the superficial analogies drawn between physical and mental differences. No one would deny that physical differences between races exist, and maintain themselves most persistently. But what does this prove with regard to the mental life of man? Our task is to discuss the various relationships existing between race and cultural, that is, mental, phenomena; for us the physical side treated by anthropology and biology is a secondary matter. Only the study of the human mind can give us an insight in the problem, i.e. psychology, ethnology, history, and sociology.

Race theories represent a strange mixture, made up of evolutionary thought on the one hand, and, on the other, the assumption of rigid race types and of absolute and fundamental differences between man and man. They are made up, further, of determinism and a moralizing view of history, of mysticism and the most blatant egotism. The political results of these theories manifest themselves in an arrogant contempt of foreign peoples and their achievements, in absurd boastfulness with regard to the excellence of one's own people, in brutal resistance of every effort towards freedom, in an intensification of national and social antagonisms, and in the crudest exaltation of force. In the mental sphere these theories lead to the greatest intolerance, to a blind narrow-mindedness, and to a loss of the capacity for critical thought and the ordinary powers of judgment. This idea of race, mostly ignored or even refuted by competent science, has, all the same, an enormous influence on the credulous mass of half-educated people to whom it is cleverly presented as the latest revelation by uncritical dilettanti, by snobbish superficial writers, and by politicians who preach it with simplicity, vulgar demagoguery and insistence. Indeed, even quite serious-minded people, lacking scientific information, and specialists without any wide general education, are not seldom affected by this tendency of the time. In certain countries this

gospel of race finds especially strong support in influential political circles, which see in it a powerful means of strengthening their position.

ARISTOTLE'S JUSTIFICATION OF SLAVERY

In as early a writer as Aristotle¹ we find modern race theories sketched in outline, and it is worth our while all the more to take note of this fact because the psychological foundation of the matter is not yet concealed. The Greek thinker treats of slavery and justifies it in the following manner: (1) Nature herself has destined some men to rule and others to serve, since to the former she gives higher capacities and to the latter the brutal strength of animals. The right of master over slave is like the right of man over beast. The ethical argument against such a position can be met by setting forth that (2) this relationship is also in the interest of those who are in subjection since they have no reasoning powers and need the guidance of those who rule over them; and, further, that (3) the conquering people is always superior by all excellent qualities. And so barbarians are born to be slaves.² Of course, there are often exceptions. Aristotle in other passages, extols the intelligence and the artistic gifts of the Asiatics, while he holds the Northerners permanently incapable of culture and statecraft for climatic reasons.

No subsequent period seeking to justify a similar relationship founded on force has added anything to these general arguments of Aristotle. Even to-day we can accept them as the quintessence of the modern pseudo-Darwinian position, represented by Lapouge, Ammon, and their school. "Physically and mentally," says Chamberlain (i, p. 503), "the Aryans surpass all other men; therefore they are by right (as Aristotle says) the masters of the world."

THE PRIVILEGES OF ARISTOCRACY JUSTIFIED

In the Middle Ages and later the nobility, as a rule, considered themselves of better blood than the common people, whom they utterly despised. The peasants were supposed to be descended from Ham, who, for lack of filial piety, was known to have been condemned by Noah to slavery. The knightly classes of many lands, on the other hand, believed themselves to be the descendants of the Trojan heroes, who after the fall of Troy were said to have settled in England, France, and Germany. This theory was seriously maintained not only in numerous songs and tales of knightly deeds, but also in many scholarly works.³ In France, the home of the Franks, their stock, even as late as the middle of the

seventeenth century, was traced back to Francion, one of Hector's sons; indeed, it is said that it was also for refuting this theory that Nicholas Freret was, in 1714, imprisoned in the Bastille.⁴ Augustin Thierry has described the great battle of ideas which raged round the question of the origin of the French from the fifteenth up to the nineteenth century, and has made clear its political importance.⁵ The theory already put forward by Bodin that the Franks were a people of Gallic stock who had wandered into Germany, and from there had returned later as deliverers of their brothers from the Roman yoke, came into favour under Louis XIV. Within the French people there was, therefore, no racial difference, but national unity of the kind so much desired by the absolute monarchy. This theory very conveniently lent support to the desire for the annexation of the Rhine, the restoration of which, as old Frankish territory, he affected to demand.⁶ It was Leibniz who destroyed this theory by proving the Germanic origin of the Franks, as indeed the German humanists had already done in the sixteenth century. The spokesmen of the nobility, especially Count de Boulainvilliers,⁷ declared that there were two races in France, the nobles who were descended from the Germanic conquerors, and the mass of the people who were descended from the subject Celts and Romans. They therefore held that the privileges of the nobles were perfectly legitimate. Of course, democratic writers protested against this feudal conception; others such as Dubos, Montesquieu, and Mably put forward compromises between the opposed views. Later on the revolutionaries adopted the conquest theory, but only to use it as a new and terrible weapon against those who had first sponsored it. The Abbé Sièyes, in his pamphlet inaugurating the Revolution, proclaims: "The third estate does not need to fear an appeal to the past. They will refer to the year preceding the conquest and since they are strong enough now to prevent their own subjugation, their resistance will without doubt be more effective. Why not drive back into the Frankish forests all those families holding the absurd notion that they are descended from the conquering race and have therefore inherited the privileges of conquerors? It seems to me that the nation thus purified will be able to take comfort in the thought that it henceforth consists exclusively of the descendants of the Gauls and Romans."⁸ It was the reactionaries who, after the Revolution and the Napoleonic period, revived the old theories and endeavoured to exploit them politically. The Count de Montlosier did this in 1814 in a way which had great influence upon political polemics of the

time.⁹ He saw on the one hand that the mixing of races, even among the nobility, was far advanced, and on the other hand he realized that it would be dangerous to trace the ancestry of the nobility back to German origins, since that would surely hurt French national feeling excited by the war. So he assumed that there were not two races but two "peoples". Both "peoples", according to his showing, were descended from all three races, but the one was from the freemen, the other from the slaves. The former were the real "French", that is to say, the nobility and their connexions; the others were the politically and socially inferior citizens. The two great historians, Augustin Thierry and P. Guizot, attacked as passionately as Sièyes had once done this revival of feudal claims.¹⁰ For thirteen hundred years, declared Guizot in 1820, the oppressed people had been fighting the foreign conquerors; the Revolution had been a real war between two peoples.

THE ORIGIN OF THE ARYAN CREED

Another favourable time for the growth of the race theory came after the later revolution of 1848. Count Gobineau, whose chief work was completed during the years 1851-5, brought to life again the old ideas of Counts Boulainvilliers and Montlosier, and he found recognition in France by some reactionaries like the Count Basterot, Count Paul de Leusse, and Count Rochechouart.¹¹ Gobineau himself admits that it was hatred of democracy and of the influence of the 1848 revolution which moved him to undertake his work, of which he says that it strikes at the very heart of liberal ideas. This poetically gifted dilettante developed into a general theory of race the old feudal theory which saw in the Revolution a rising of the inferior Celts against the Germanic nobility. Also the ordinary Germanic or Aryan citizen belonged now to the "racial" aristocracy, and the position and value of the peoples were determined by the amount of Aryan blood in their veins. Such a theory was of course very well suited to attract new members from the rank and file of the citizens to the feudal ruling class, which had been devastated by the storms of the Revolution, for the bourgeoisie in turn had begun to feel itself threatened by the proletariat, and in its own defence gladly adopted the claim to belong to one of the races intended by nature to rule.

Nevertheless, Gobineau found little acceptance in France. The ideas of 1789 had penetrated too deeply into the masses; the peasants were determined to maintain the division of property achieved by the Revolution. People in France saw through the

AND THEORIES OF RACE

device—Gobineau had merely dressed up the old feudal theory in a new garment. Further, it must have been a blow to national feeling that Gobineau should look upon the Germans as the noblest race, although he did not express very favourable judgments upon the modern Germans whom he did not consider to be predominantly Germanic. So in France Gobineau fell into complete oblivion, from which he was rescued in our days in the first place by E. Seillière, who criticized his theory rather severely. The later French race theorists, G. Vacher de Lapouge and Le Bon, when they were working on their books, knew nothing of Gobineau's teaching, and Lapouge stated in 1899 that Gobineau was unknown in France, and, especially, that no one wanted to know him. Ideas of race played a certain rôle in the thought of Ernest Renan, but later he turned away from them completely, and in a letter to Gobineau he emphasizes the idea that race is of importance only in the beginning of history, becoming of less and less importance as time goes on.

BELIEF IN RACE AND NATIONALISM IN FRANCE

In modern France the nationalists used the race argument especially against the Germans and the Jews. Even outstanding politicians and scholars have treated the Franco-German conflict as a natural antagonism between the higher Gallic or Latin race and the inferior German race. Aggressive French nationalism especially based its schemes upon the argument that the German-speaking inhabitants of Alsace and of the Rhineland were of Celtic origin and that the call of their blood drew them towards France.

However, nationalistic slogans seem to have been losing ground of late. Yet there are still to be found in French and Belgian school-books incredible appeals to national and race hatred, as is shown in a voluminous report published by the Carnegie Foundation.¹² One finds there, for example: "The war appears to have proved that the Germans, taken as a whole, have, as a result of perverse racial instincts, a leaning to evil—physical indulgence, innate malice, and cruelty, an instinct to rob and plunder and murder, ingratitude for even the noblest hospitality, forgetfulness of services rendered them, exaggerated and bitter chauvinism caused by jealous hate of other lands, hereditary and abnormal ambition to achieve world-supremacy, complete lack of generosity, inability to understand the heroism or unselfishness of opponents. They have given convincing proof that hypocrisy, servility, and cunning are characteristic of their race; that cruelty and evil are innate and irrepressible instincts in them; that they have no human instincts,

no idea of right and justice, no understanding of honour, and no sense of humour." This mad outburst of race hatred is to be found in a school-book by two Belgian pedagogues, Mirquet, who is the head of a school, and a university professor, Pergameni. The book is meant to be used in the education of children between the ages of 10 and 12 years. Saddest fact of all, this book was awarded a prize on 3rd May, 1920, by the Royal Belgian Academy.

The coloured peoples of the French colonies are, as a rule, treated upon an equal footing with other citizens; the franchise, active and passive, is often theirs, and they are allowed to become officials. There is no restriction of intermarriage.¹³

BELIEF IN RACE IN ENGLAND

In England Daniel Defoe, the great author, in his satire *The True-born Englishman* (1701),¹⁴ has most wittily ridiculed race arrogance in his own people, and it stands to the credit of public opinion in England at that time that this work, which carries national self-criticism rather far, very quickly achieved popularity. Within four years there appeared nine authentic and twelve pirated editions; of the cheaper editions no less than eighty thousand copies were sold in the streets of London. But even in England belief in the superiority of the English race was always widespread. The race argument was launched especially against the "Celtic" Irish, with the purpose of showing how great was their inferiority to the Anglo-Saxons, and how deep were the differences between the two peoples.¹⁵ The fact is, that the race argument was employed everywhere to justify "scientifically" national domination and oppression. Political good sense, however, and the English sense of fairness finally turned away from these pseudo-arguments, and succeeded in solving the Irish question. The idea that the Teutonic race is superior to all others is also to be found in the works of various writers and scholars, but this was rather the expression of a romantic mood, and had no influence in the political sphere except in the already mentioned Irish question. England is certainly the land in which race prejudice plays comparatively the smallest rôle, simply because, of all nations, the English shows the greatest political maturity, and because in the process of governing a world empire she has had far and away the widest experience in dealing with all kinds of different races. Time and again Indians have been returned to Parliament by English constituencies, or called to the Upper House. It is also a characteristic fact that the Jew, Benjamin Disraeli, who himself was accustomed to exaggerate

the importance of race in general, and of the Jewish race in particular,¹⁶ was able to become Prime Minister, and the hero of the conservative and nationally-minded aristocracy—an event which to the Conservatives of continental nations must remain a complete riddle.

Among the English as indeed among all the predominantly Germanic peoples, there is a particularly strong feeling against inter-marriage with coloured peoples, even although these may be the possessors of an ancient culture such as Indians, Chinese, Egyptians, Arabs. This aversion is by no means so strong among the Latin peoples.¹⁷

The position of native races in the British Colonies and Dominions varies very much.¹⁸ In India, of course, practically equal rights are the rule: the highest positions are open to Indians. It may, in passing, be noticed that the late Viceroy of India, Lord Reading, was of Jewish descent. Indeed, it is merely a question of time until India receives the same independence which the other great Dominions enjoy. In New Zealand the Maoris are legally and practically on an equal footing with the other citizens; so also are the Negroes in Jamaica and in some other territories. Further, so far as the influence of the English Parliament, English officials, and clergymen goes, the natives are everywhere assured of protection and justice. Special care is taken to avoid rousing in them the feeling that they are being pushed into the background on account of their race. But in many English colonies and especially in the Dominions which are independent of the Mother Country, coloured people are disliked, and held to be inferior, and are sometimes very unfairly treated. Indeed, Asiatic immigrants, especially Indians, Japanese, and Chinese, enter these countries with difficulty, or are even forbidden entry in spite of the fact that the English Government, with its eye upon discontent in India, does not approve of this attitude. "Coloured" people are not usually received "in good society", and often they may not attend the schools where there are white children. Inter-marriage is rare, but is not forbidden. Lynching does not exist. In South Africa (except in the former Boer provinces and Natal) the Negroes have the same right of franchise as the whites; owing to educational and income qualifications, however, few Negroes can exercise the right. This fact involves great danger for the future, for the coloured inhabitants form the great majority of the population. In many districts inhabited by white and by black people together an attempt is being made to give the coloured people representation in special councils, so that perhaps two parliamentary systems will develop side by side.

RACE · HATRED

BELIEF IN RACE IN GERMANY

For a long time Germany was predominantly cosmopolitan, and her great thinkers and writers, Herder, Goethe, Schiller, are the highest embodiments of this spirit. But the great rise of German nationalism during the last decade of the nineteenth century was accompanied by an extraordinary growth of racial pride, and many influential circles looked down with scorn upon the "inferior" Latin, Celtic, and Slav peoples.¹⁹ Nowhere have race theories had so pernicious an influence as in German-speaking countries. They served as welcome weapons against democracy, for the mass of the people was represented as coming of pre-Aryan races—a doctrine which Ammon tried to prove by an exhaustive series of skull measurements. In contrast to the "people", the higher classes were, it is said, of Germanic blood, and therefore born to rule. This noble race was also destined to dominate the world—a faith proclaimed by numerous Pan-German writers. This aggressive Pan-Germanism was provided with its race theory by the Frenchman Gobineau and by the Englishman Chamberlain.²⁰ Both of these were closely connected with Richard Wagner's circle, in which they found strong support, for the characters and the motifs of Wagner's compositions provided no small incitement to racial pride. Ludwig Schemann became an enthusiastic apostle of Gobineau; he founded a Gobineau association and a Gobineau museum. The writings of this French count were systematically spread by the Pan-Germans. Soon, however, H. S. Chamberlain began to take his place. Friedrich hit off the differences between them in the words: "Chamberlain's victorious triumphal song of the glory of the Teutons, and Gobineau's sad requiem of the dying splendour of the Aryans." As Schemann says, Chamberlain became "the leader of all those who need for their quickening a stronger dose of the illusion without which nothing on this earth is accomplished". Kaiser Wilhelm II became Chamberlain's strongest propagandist; he himself read Chamberlain's chief work to his sons, and caused it also to be distributed among the officers of the army, while a rich endowment made possible the placing of free copies of the work in many libraries and associations. In his *Memories of My Life*, the ex-Emperor William could still write: "The glory of Teutonism was first revealed and preached to an amazed Germany by Chamberlain's *Foundations of the Nineteenth Century*, but all in vain, as the collapse of the German people proves."

This belief in race penetrated into the realm of science itself, and a number of organizations were charged with the task of providing the belief with a scientific foundation. At last things went so far that associations for racial eugenics were formed, members of which were only allowed to marry after a very careful inquiry into their pedigree, in order that any mixing with an inferior race might be avoided. In all this we can see how real was the contribution of racial theories to the development and the strengthening of that attitude of mind which finally brought catastrophe upon the whole German people.²¹ An infinitely exaggerated estimate of their own power, coupled with an undervaluation of that of other peoples, made them blind to the dangers of a political programme which was bound to end in ruin.

In introducing the great German army bill on 7th April, 1913, an event regarded in many quarters as an introduction to the world-war, the German Chancellor, Bethmann-Hollweg, spoke of the threat of a collision between the Slavs and the Germans, and said that the latter were being compelled to increase armaments by the new and extreme manifestation of racial feeling among the Pan-Slavs. These ill-considered words were felt to be a blow in the face by the Slavs of Austria-Hungary, who constituted the strongest racial group in that empire, and they served in the world-war as most effective propaganda in ranging all Slavs on the side of fellow-members of their race. When the war broke out it was hailed from many sides as a war of races. An article by the illustrious historian Karl Lamprecht is especially worth noticing in this connexion. It appeared in the *Berliner Tagblatt* of 23rd August, 1914, and also as a pamphlet. In it the writer spoke of the struggle of the Germanic peoples and the Latin (Catholic) Slav peoples, on the one hand, against the encroachments of Eastern barbarians on the other, as in line with the struggles of the past against the Magyars and the Turks—as though Turks and Magyars were not fighting on the side of Germany! Then Lamprecht discovered that Scandinavia, Holland, Switzerland, and America were, on account of race feeling, sympathetic to Germany, and he announced triumphantly: "It is blood that tells!" The illusion that America was to be counted as an ally led him to go so far as to "announce the living future of a Teuto-Germanic race!" Since England, however, could not be fitted into this scheme, the great historian went on to declare: "It is noteworthy that at the very centre of the British empire it is no longer the pure Germanic spirit, but rather the Celtic spirit which is in control." The fact that a really great scholar who was not

even a chauvinist could be guilty of such incomprehensible confusion of mind shows better than anything else can the evil influence which the belief in race exercises upon men's thinking!

RACE HATRED IN AMERICA

The Gobineau theory had a favourable reception in America. As a matter of fact, the French aristocrat thoroughly disliked American democracy, and, as his disciple Schemann says (p. 376), he even saw in the American spirit coupled with that of the Jews, the evil genius of humanity in the modern world. The theory, however, was a welcome weapon in the struggle of the slave-owners against the abolition of slavery which raged during the sixties of last century. Consequently Gobineau's book was at once translated and spread abroad in America; the slave-owners of the Southern States themselves commissioned scholars to prove that the Negro is not a human being, or, at least, less of a human being than a white person, and that, in consequence, slavery is justified in the Aristotelian fashion. It was also pointed out that slavery was justified on Biblical grounds, since it was clear that the Negroes had descended from one who had been cursed of God—the black colour was the mark of Cain.²² Unfortunately the law of "might is right" was on the side of the Northern States, as the outcome of the war proved. The "sacred" right to own slaves was abolished. Yet even to-day throughout large areas in America the most elementary civil rights are denied to Negroes, although this is contrary to the spirit of the constitution. In the Southern States especially, they are treated with the greatest contempt and compelled to submit to a number of humiliating special laws. The brutal lynchings which are still practised upon Negroes are among the most shameful stains that besmirch white "civilization". In addition, the influx of immigrants from Europe and Asia, usually belonging to a very low level of civilization, increased the race hatred. It was chiefly against Asiatics that this race hatred raged, and especially against Japanese, Chinese, and Indians, whose capacity for culture no one can question. Quite recently the United States passed a law excluding Asiatics from the Union, apparently quite untroubled by the fact that thereby the danger of a world-conflict with Japan, and even of a rising all over Asia against the whites has been brought appreciably nearer. Indeed, race prejudices of all kinds seem always to find a favourable soil in America.²³

The immigration act of 1924 is restricting immigration very severely, especially that of Slavs and South Europeans. This

is leading to increased employment of Negroes in the industrial districts, and a consequent embitterment of race antagonism.

Of course, economic motives are at the back of this policy, namely the fear of American workers and small farmers that they will be undercut by immigrants with a lower standard of life. We find the same motives also in Australia, South Africa, and Canada, but race hatred too, throws its weight into the scales, especially in the movement directed against the immigration of Japanese. The relatively small number of Japanese immigrants has not really displaced many white workers. Further, the Japanese standard of life is not lower than that of the East and South-European immigrants, and in any case, the right and proper desire not to allow the common standard of life to be reduced by foreigners who can work at lower rates than the American workers could be more effectively attained either by a law which made it impossible to employ foreign labourers at lower wages than American, or by a special tax upon the goods produced under such cheaper conditions.

RACE HATRED, WORLD TRADE, AND WORLD PEACE

In all parts of the world Europeans have either driven the coloured peoples away from the soil of their forefathers, or have depressed them into a subject or proletarian population without any rights or, at least, as in India and in Egypt, have placed them under tutelage. The only reasons offered as an excuse for this were: "Our own interest and right to live demands it," and also "the need of the world for gold, cotton, wheat, etc., is better satisfied by this means".²⁴ The white man has taken possession of enormous territories to exploit which he does not possess the necessary labour. The over-populated lands of Asia could provide sufficient labour power. Such workers, indeed, would be glad to escape the poverty caused by lack of living room at home. These Asiatics could produce food and raw material in Australia, America, and South Africa for the white population of Europe and America, and would, besides, become buyers of the industrial products of these lands. Now this necessary pre-condition of a development of world trade is being frustrated by negative immigration laws originating in egotism and race hatred. In this case the principles by which the whites justify their occupation of colonies are quite disregarded; neither the native's right to live nor the general interest of the world are taken into account. It is no wonder that the racial animosity of

those who are oppressed is increasing to a point at which it will become a great danger to the peaceful development of the world.

Undoubtedly this race madness is among the chief causes which led to the ghastly slaughter of the world war. It is a mistake to seek its origin mainly in economic factors. If the bankers, merchants, or industrials of the whole world, or their workers and clerks, had had to decide, the great war would not have broken out. The real causes of modern wars are irrational in character; they lie in the overgrowth of that self-consciousness which considers the smallest concession to an enemy nation to be ignominious. To this overdone sense of importance the idolatry of race has contributed a great deal. There is in this sense a certain truth in the prophecy of G. Vacher de Lapouge, the chief French protagonist of race, when he said twenty-five years ago: "I am convinced that men will slaughter each other by the million in the coming century for the sake of a slight difference in skull measurements. By this sign which will replace the Biblical shibboleth and the relationship of language related races will recognize each other, and the last of the sentimentalists will live to witness a great extirpation among the peoples."²⁵

RACE THEORY AND SCIENCE

It is a strange thing that so many scholars have fallen victims to the demon contained in this idea of race. Indeed, in many politically backward lands it is precisely the academic circles which have become strongholds of race prejudice. The reason for this lies in the over-development of specialization and of merely technical instruction in many colleges—a state of things which Kant in his day described ironically as "factory-like"²⁶—and also in powerful political traditions and in economic selfishness.

Most of the great masters of the natural and mental sciences have, with striking unity and decisiveness, combated the illusion that mankind is split up by mental differences which are profound and unchangeable. Such men, to name only a few (those still living being excepted), as J. G. Herder, A. von Humboldt, K. E. von Baer, J. Müller, J. C. Prichard, C. Darwin, T. Huxley, H. T. Buckle, J. S. Mill, H. Spencer, R. Virchow, M. Schleiden, A. de Toqueville, E. Réclus, A. de Quatrefages, A. Bastian, T. Waitz, F. Ratzel, F. von Luschan, J. von Ranke, all agree in this point of view. Alexander von Humboldt said: "In stating that mankind is a unity we also desire to combat the unpleasant assumption that there are higher and lower races. There are certainly mouldable, more highly educated races and races which, through mental culture,

have been ennobled. But there are no 'nobler' races" (*Kosmos*, i, 382). The greatest comparative anthropologist, Rudolf Virchow, was of the opinion that when one took an all-inclusive view of humanity one could not avoid the thought that we are actually brothers and sisters. That brilliant scholar K. E. von Baer, spoke very appropriately of the belief in the great inferiority of Negroes as an attempt on the part of brutal slave owners to pacify their consciences; he said: "serious and learned men have often expressed themselves in opposition to this idea for many zoological reasons. But the idea will not disappear quickly all the same, simply because zoological reasons have no weight with many of those who believe themselves capable of having an opinion in these matters."

Leading men of research in all regions of mental science come to the same conclusions. As early a writer as Helvetius in France pointed out that nations out of pride consider those characteristics to be inborn racial virtues which spring merely from their own form of government. He adds that every people admires its own faults and shows contempt for the opposite qualities. In order to be a success in any country one must be able to show oneself the hump of the nation.²⁷ J. G. Herder, perhaps the finest and most universal student of the human soul, stood most definitely and decidedly against the idea of deep-seated differences between races. The very use of the word "race" in connexion with man caused him deep misgiving.²⁸ The well-known historian of culture, H. T. Buckle, wrote that he cordially subscribed to the remark made by one of the greatest thinkers of the time (J. S. Mill) that "of all the vulgar modes of escaping from the consideration of the effect of social and moral influences on the human mind, the most vulgar is that of attributing the diversities of conduct and character to inherent natural differences". The founders of the comparative study of Indo-Germanic languages, Aug. Friedr. Pott, Max Müller, O. Schrader, have completely destroyed the scientific accessories surrounding the Aryan cult. The same opinion is clearly expressed by the great lawyer, R. von Ihering.²⁹

Of special importance is the opinion of Élisée Réclus, the famous geographer, whose tremendous work in twenty volumes, *A New Universal Geography*, one can only look upon with wonder and admiration. In the introduction to this work he emphasizes how important it is to be on guard against the danger of exalting one race. He says that even the smallest and most undeveloped tribes look upon themselves as the most perfect representatives of the

RACE HATRED

world. Foreigners they describe as dumb, deaf, stammering, filthy creatures, idiots, monsters, or demons. And he goes on to say that the superiority of Europe is due not to racial gifts or characteristics, but to fortunate geographical conditions, and that Europe will eventually be overtaken. Réclus' fellow countryman, the famous A. de Quatrefages, says that it is easy to see that all men have practically the same moral faculties, both good and evil, but that unfortunately the resemblance in the case of the evil is usually more strongly marked. The prominent geographer and ethnologist, C. Peschel, is of the opinion that, at any rate as far as the power of thought is concerned, there is no questioning the unity and equality of mankind. Most overwhelming of all has been the testimony of those interrelated sciences, ethnology, anthropology, folk-psychology, and sociology. These sciences have established the fact that the development of peoples, provided it is contemporary and under similar conditions, often follows such similar lines that there remains little room for the influence of the racial factor. This is made clear in, for example, the monumental works of such leading scholars as J. C. Prichard, T. Waitz, G. Gerland, A. Bastian, Herbert Spencer, F. Ratzel, H. Westermarck, P. W. Schmidt, F. von Luschan, and also in numberless works by specialists.³⁰ Our greatest German investigator, Friedrich Ratzel, refers constantly in his *Ethnology* and in his *Anthropo-Geography* to the marked mental and cultural likenesses between all the races of the world. He summarizes his standpoint in the following sentences: "There is only one humanity, whose divergences of form are many, but not deep." "As a matter of fact, the gulf fixed between two groups of humanity by difference of culture is completely independent of their differences of talent." "Race has nothing to do with the possession of culture." Felix von Luschan is of the same opinion³¹: "There are no savage peoples; there are only peoples whose culture is different from our own. The decisive characters among so-called 'races' are essentially the result of climatic, social, and other outside circumstances. There are no fundamentally inferior races. The differences between races, especially the moral and intellectual differences, are not nearly so great as those which exist between individual members of one and the same race." Ferdinand von Andrian expressed the same opinion. The ethnologist Father W. Schmidt, one of the chief representatives of the modern "Kultur-kreislehre", says that the equal fundamental endowment of the human mind all the world over is a firmly established acquisition of modern ethnology.

Let us add to the testimony of ethnologists that of a few philosophers and sociologists. Wilhelm Wundt expresses himself definitely against the view that moral ideas are confined to a few cultured peoples.³² And he adds: "No open-minded man can avoid the conviction that such moral differences are not greater than those in the region of the intellect, where, in spite of the great variety of outlook and ways of thought the universality of the laws of thought remains unshakable." In his *Völkerpsychologie* he writes: "If there is anything which anthropology has firmly established, it is the fact that the qualities of human creative imagination, and those feelings and emotions which influence it in its results, are in their essential characteristics the same in men of all lands and regions." The philosopher Münsterberg³³ hits off race theories when he says that they are simply other forms of materialism, a poor substitute for philosophy, the last result of an anti-philosophic age. Friedrich Jodl, that fine-minded philosopher, says³⁴: "There is no madness more fatal, and none which we must fight harder, than that which would look upon moral strength or moral weakness as the peculiar inheritance of a particular race or nation." With crushing sarcasm Nietzsche exploded the belief in race. Of the many other scholars who reject race theories, we mention only the sociologist and national economist, Max Weber, and the historians Eduard Meyer and Ludwig Riess.³⁵

With intuitive insight great poets have long seen the oneness of humanity, and their words often sound like a premonition, a protest against pride of caste and race. Shakespeare wrote (*All's Well that Ends Well*, ii, 3):—

"Strange it is that our bloods,
Of colour, weight, and heat, pour'd all together,
Would quite confound distinction, yet stand off
In differences so mighty."

Herder, Goethe, Schiller, Lessing—these among others—rejected entirely national fanaticism, which is closely allied to race madness, and recognized humanity as one.³⁶

NOTES TO CHAPTER I

¹ Aristotle's *Politics*, i, 1, 2. Cf. also Rousseau, *Contrat social*, chaps ii and iii.

² Already in antiquity strong opposition was raised to the contempt of barbarians on racial grounds, e.g. by Plato in his *Statesman*. Cf. also Gomperz, *Griechische Denker*, i, p. 325; iii, 2nd edition, p. 258. J. Jüthner, *Hellenen und Barbaren, aus der Geschichte des Nationalbewusstseins*, 1923.

³ Cf. e.g. the chronicles of Geoffrey of Monmouth. The theory is mentioned first in the chronicles ascribed to an unknown author usually called Fredegar. Cf. Jansen and Schmitz-Kallenberg, *Historographie u. Quellen d. deutschen Geschichte bis 1500* (1914), p. 19.

⁴ In Russia a German professor, Müller, tried in 1749 to prove that the Russians were of Finnish-Tataric race. The Empress Elisabeth ordered his immediate imprisonment, and the secretary of the Academy, Trediakowski, who had stated that Müller was right, to be given a hundred lashes with the knout. Müller was forced to recant.

⁵ Augustin Thierry, *Récits des temps Mérovingiens précédés de considérations sur l'histoire de France* (first published 1840). Cf. also René Johannet, *Le principe des nationalités*, 1923, p. 34 seq.

⁶ Cf. Pufendorf, *Verfassung des Deutschen Reiches*, §§ 3-6 (translation by Bresslau, 1870; cf. particularly the comments of Professor Bresslau on p. 31).

⁷ C. de Boulainvilliers, *Histoire de l'ancien gouvernement de la France*, 3 vols, 1727 (published posthumously).

⁸ Also in the English revolution of 1647 democratic writers referred to the time before the Norman conquest and demanded that the tyrannic rule of the Normans over the English should be abolished. Cf. Trevelyan, *England under the Stuarts*, p. 282.

⁹ C. de Montlosier, *De la Monarchie française*, 7 vols., 1814-22.

¹⁰ Thierry, *Considérations sur l'histoire de France* (nouvelle édition, 1868), p. 129; Louis Halphen, *L'histoire en France depuis cent ans*, 1914, p. 22.

¹¹ On the origin and influence of Gobineau's ideas, cf. the two important books by Ernest Seillière, *Le Comte de Gobineau et l'aryanisme historique*, 1913, and Ludwig Schemann, *Gobineaus Rassenwerk*, 1910.

¹² *Enquête sur les livres scolaires d'après guerre*, 1923. Report of Dr. Prudhommeaux.

¹³ Cf. J. H. Oldham, *Christianity and the Race Problem*, 1924, pp. 148, 160, 176.

¹⁴ Daniel Defoe, *The True-born Englishman*. Defoe is defending William III, who was attacked by English nationalists as "Dutch". This may, of course, have helped the circulation of the book.

¹⁵ A profound critical survey of these theories is given by John M. Robertson in his two excellent books, *The Saxon and the Celt*, 1897, and *The Germans*, 1916, p. 19, and by W. D. Babington, *Fallacies of Race Theories*, 1895, pp. 147-246.

¹⁶ Particularly in his *Life of Lord Bentinck*, xxiv seq., Disraeli praises the Jews and the Semites in a rather objectionable way.

¹⁷ Aversion to race mixing requires, of course, no special attention as long as it is a private antipathy based on sexual or æsthetic taste. Only when legal measures or social boycotts are applied does it poison relations between races.

¹⁸ Cf. a good survey in J. H. Oldham's *Christianity and the Race Problem*, 1924, pp. 94-196, and T. W. Gregory, *The Menace of Colour*, 1925. Cf. also James Bryce, *Impressions from South Africa*.

¹⁹ In particular Bismarck, who was not an extreme nationalist, often pointed out that the Latin races were exhausted and would perish. He also said that Celts and Slavs had a female, passive, unproductive character, and the Germans were far superior. Yet he believed that the Germans required a

Slavic admixture. Cf. very significant utterances in Poschinger, *Neue Tischgespräche Bismarcks*, vol. ii, p. 38, Bluntschli, *Denkwürdiges aus meinem Leben*, 1884, vol. iii, p. 95, M. Busch, *Tagebuchblätter*, 1899, vol. ii, p. 118. (Speech to a Styrian delegation of 15th April, 1895.)

²⁰ There were, of course, race theorists in Germany before Gobineau and Chamberlain; but they had no great success. Cf. on these forerunners Theobald Bieder, *Geschichte der Germanenforschung*, 2 vols., 1921-2, Ch. Andler, *Le Pangermanisme philosophique*, 1917, and *Les origines du Pangermanisme*, 1915.

²¹ Lapouge complained in 1909 that race theories did not find any attention in France, and that they had almost become a monopoly of Germany, where they formed the creed of aggressive Pan-Germanism. However, Lapouge admires the Pan-Germans because they dared to challenge in the name of Aryanism the Anglo-Saxons, the most Aryan race, in a struggle for world supremacy (Lapouge, *Race et milieu social*).

²² Cf. Halle, *Baumwollproduktion und Pflanzungswirtschaft in den Nordamerikanischen Südstaaten*, 1897, vol. i, p. 321. In the times of slavery there were Americans who came to the following conclusion. "Man has been created after the image of God. Since God is no negro, the negro can be no man."

²³ From 1900 to 1922 a total of 1,731 lynchings was recorded, of which 1,552 were of coloured people. A careful and judicious statement of the position of Negroes in America is given by T. W. Gregory, *The Menace of Colour*, 1925. Cf. also J. Bryce, *The American Commonwealth*.

²⁴ Cf. Lothrop Stoddard, *The Rising Tide of Colour*, 1920; Madison Grant, *The Passing of the Great Race*, 1916; C. Gould, *America, a Family Matter*, 1922.

²⁵ Cf. Manouvrier, "L'indice céphalique et la pseudo-sociologie" (*Revue de l'Ecole d'Anthropologie de Paris*), 1899, pp. 233, 280 seq.

²⁶ Cf. Kant, *Der Streit der Fakultäten* (introduction).

²⁷ Helvetius, *De l'esprit, Œuvres complètes*, ii, 21, 22, 1777, pp. 171, 175.

²⁸ Cf. Herder's *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit*, published by Duntzer, vol. ix, pp. 155, 158; vol. x, pp. 39, 42 seq.

²⁹ Cf. H. T. Buckle, *History of Civilization in England*, vol. i, 1. R von Ihering, *Vorgeschichte der Indoeuropäer*, 1894, pp. 97, 98, 188.

³⁰ Cf. Achelis, *Moderne Völkerkunde*, 1894, J. C. Prichard, *Researches into the Physical History of Man*, 1836 (Germ. edition, 1870), Waitz and Gerland, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, 6 vols., 1859. The works of Bastian fill innumerable volumes. Cf. also H. Westermarck, *The origin and development of moral ideas*, 1906, 2 vols., and Schmidt and Koppers, *Völker und Kulturen*, 1st vol. 1924. As regards living authorities who take a similar view, I refer only to F. Birkner, G. Buschan, J. Kohlbrugge, R. Thurnwald, F. Oppenheimer, Robert Michels.

³¹ In his excellent book, *Völker, Rassen, Sprachen*, 1922, p. 187.

³² W. Wundt, *Ethik*, 4th edition, 1912, vol. i, p. 40. Cf. also vol. ii, p. 281.

³³ Cf. Münsterberg, *Die Amerikaner*, 1904, vol. i, p. 3.

³⁴ Friedr. Jodl, *Wesen und Ziele der ethischen Bewegung*, p. 22.

³⁵ Cf. Max Weber in *Verhandlungen des zweiten deutschen Soziologentages*, 1912, pp. 74, 188, 190; also M. Weber, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, 1922; L. Riess, *Historik*, 1912, vol. i, pp. 71-82; Bernheim, *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode und der Geschichtsphilosophie*, 1903, p. 594, and Eduard Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*, 3rd edition, 1910, i, 1, p. 77. Oswald Spengler also is against the usual race theories, cf. O. Spengler, *Untergang des Abendlandes*, vol. ii, 1922, pp. 121, 132, 148, 392.

³⁶ Cf. the opinion of Theodor Mommsen in Hermann Bahr's *Der Antisemitismus*, 1894, p. 26 seq. Collections of many other such utterances on anti-semitism are to be found in the books: *Antisemitenspiegel* (3rd edition, 1911), Schrattenholz, *Antisemitenhammer, eine Anthologie aus der Weltliteratur*, 1894, and *Deutscher Geist und Judenhass*, 1920.

CHAPTER II

THE PHYSICAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE RACES OF MANKIND IN RELATION TO THEIR MENTAL LIFE

THE TERM "RACE"

RACE is a term used in natural science. It denotes a subdivision of the species which inherits its characteristics. Living creatures are usually reckoned to belong to the same species if they breed successfully when crossed, and if their offspring possess the same capacity without limits. Yet even this definition is not quite exact. There are certain different species which to some degree inter-breed successfully, as do also the resulting hybrids. Even between species, therefore, there are no unbridgeable gulfs, far less as between races of the same species.

Long ago Lamarck said : " Divisions are only artificial names ; for, in truth, nature has formed neither classes nor orders, neither families, nor sorts, nor species." Kant also emphasizes the difference between natural and artificial divisions.¹ It is especially clear that racial divisions are for the most part artificial, for the greatest anthropologists differ widely in the matter. For instance, Cuvier and Quatrefages put the number of racial divisions among mankind at 3, Linnaeus and Huxley distinguish 11 human races, Blumenbach 5, Buffon 6, Prichard, Hunter, and Peschel 7, Agassiz 8, Desmoulins and Pickering 11, Haeckel and Franz Müller 12, Bory St. Vincent 15, Malte Brun 16, Topinard 18, Morton 32, Crawford 60, Burke 62, Gliddon 150. And even then when two agree as to the actual number, they disagree as to the division. As a matter of fact, one might just as well assume that there were 1,000 races ; every individual indeed forms a race or a mixture of races. Even between races most distant from each other there exist innumerable, almost unnoticeable transitions. Nevertheless, such terms as race and species are extremely useful in the sphere of natural science.

As a consequence of all this many representatives of the sciences of culture refuse to employ the term "race", since it belongs exclusively to the realm of the natural sciences. Herder condemned the use of the term race with regard to human beings. In our time many eminent investigators, such as Friedrich Müller, Friedrich

Ratzel, Paul Topinard, Rudolf Martin, Karl Schuchardt, have, one after the other, emphasized the point of view that anthropology should concern itself with races and ethnology with peoples; but this rule has not always been adhered to. A leading ethnologist of the present time, Father W. Schmidt, expressly says that as long as we know nothing of the connexion between the body and mind the time has not yet come for ethnology, as a mental science, to base discussions on the conception of race held in the natural sciences.² In this connexion he can cite Wundt, who insists upon the recognition of the peculiar nature and special laws of mental life. One of the greatest of anthropologists and ethnographers, Luschan, believes that the word "race" might well be given up, if we could only find a less ambiguous term.

Professor Eugen Fischer's method, therefore, of defining race as a larger group with inherited physical and mental characteristics begs the question and is a retrograde step.³ Such a definition in a modern text-book of anthropology takes the writer outside his sphere. Kant, of course, in his *Anthropology* could treat of the inherited and acquired national character because he meant by "anthropology" something quite different from what we mean, namely study of the human character, not of the body.

THE PROBLEM

Is it, then, from this standpoint, not superfluous to concern ourselves with questions of natural science, when our real task is to study something mental and spiritual, that is culture? Certainly not. For it is not sufficient to controvert the uncritical materialism of racial science merely upon philosophic grounds. It can be demonstrated that its fundamental assumptions, even from the view-point of natural science, are either wholly or in part, untenable; not to mention its false conclusions as regards the mind. Racial theories have mainly been based on the following anthropological statements:—

1. The physical differences between races are so deep and persistent that one ought really to speak of different species of human beings.
2. These different species or races have also different origins (polygenesis), or, at least, have been kept severely apart from each other since the earliest times.
3. A great argument for this is found in the likeness to animals, or in the primitive traits which characterize certain races.

4. On the other hand, certain racial physical features are accompanied by genius and by creative and civilizing gifts generally. (The Nordic race alone initiates civilization.)

5. The mingling of races leads to sterility, degeneration, and the break up of civilization. (The downfall of the ancient world.)

6. The transformation, physical or mental, of races is impossible save by selection. Environment and education have no influence; acquired characteristics especially cannot be inherited.

7. Variation in type is always due to a racial change and involves mental changes also. The supposed elimination of the Nordic type in modern times.

8. In order to maintain a healthy race the keenest struggle for existence is necessary, and the ruthless eradication of all weaker elements. Democracy and social reform are therefore detrimental.

UNITY OF THE HUMAN RACE—PRIMITIVE FORMS

A few decades back there was a widespread controversy on the question of "the unity of the human race", by which was meant sometimes the question whether the races of mankind constitute independent stocks, or are merely varieties of the same single stock, and at other times the rather different question whether all races have derived from one primitive stock or not.⁴ The modern belief in the relationship of all living beings rather lessens the importance of these questions. It is noteworthy, however, that the greatest scientific investigators have always been on the side of unity. Ranke, the well-known anatomist, summing it all up, says: "It seems to us specially important in the modern Darwinian natural philosophy that, owing to it, the assumption that the human race has one common ancestry—an idea which has for long held the chief place in the minds of anatomical anthropologists, building upon their own careful and patient studies—has won its way, even among those parts of the public which could not understand anatomical proofs in their bearing on the problem, and would not be convinced by them in any case." The modern half-educated man indeed has adopted Darwinism only so far as to ascribe to other races the resemblance to animals so generally believed in. All slave-owners or their partisans have been in the habit of explaining that the Negro is an animal. On the outbreak of the world-war the Japanese were called in Germany "yellow monkeys", although a short time before that, while there was still hope that they might become allies, they had been hailed everywhere exultantly. In every land nationalist

caricatures have always portrayed enemies with hideous and bestial features.

The belief that certain races more closely resemble animals, physically and mentally, than others finds no support in anatomy or the theory of evolution.

The Dutch anatomist Kohlbrugge has dealt comprehensively with this question.⁵ He shows that there is no generally adopted opinion as to what is really meant by "primitive"; indeed, there are five different definitions of it which take as their standard sometimes the likeness to apes, or to the lower animals, sometimes the likeness to embryo forms, etc. Cuvier knew that the skull of the young ape more closely resembles the human skull than does that of the full-grown ape, while the differences only gradually become more marked. The same is true of the skulls of Europeans and Negroes, which in children are exactly the same, while that of the Negro diverges later from the common form. Therefore, according to the bio-genetic law, it would seem that the human type (including the European) is the older and the more primitive. This fact has also been used as a proof that man is not descended from ape-like beings. Some leading authorities, indeed, have taken the position that it is more probable that apes and the higher animals have developed from forms which more closely resembled the human one, but this is denied by others (Schwalbe, Martini).⁶

Kohlbrugge comes to the conclusion: "Higher differentiation in an anatomical sense has nothing to do with higher mentality." Indeed, it is clear that those very peoples which have retained the primitive child-like forms, such as the Caucasians, Mongols, Hindus, and Malays, have attained also to the highest mental development; but the Eskimos and the Tierra del Fuegians must be accounted for here, too.

With regard to other animal features which are usually ascribed to primitive peoples, Weissbach, one of the first authorities on the subject, says that the ape-likeness is by no means limited to any one particular people, but that each people must be regarded as having inherited something of this relationship; and certainly we Europeans cannot claim to be completely without those traits. Martin says about the same (p. 593). Further it was pointed out that many lower forms are even more commonly met with among whites than among coloured peoples, and that, as a matter of fact, the typical features of these latter often show a decided development of those characteristics which differentiate men from apes, and for which the term "excessively human forms" is employed.

ORIGIN AND VARIATION OF RACE CHARACTERISTICS

It can hardly be questioned any longer that the external variations among human races are adaptations to natural conditions. It is only with regard to the manner and the speed of the adaptation that any difference of opinion exists. This is not the place for an exhaustive explanation of the theories of race development, since we are concerned only with the mental implications of race. Greater or lesser adaptability of race characteristics would possibly be of importance for us if it had ever been established that great differences in the mental and spiritual capacity existed. But this has never been proved. Of course, this question belongs exclusively to the sphere of the mental sciences. Since, however, research into the question of possible mental variations among races has not produced hitherto any positive result, there is, so far as the problem of culture is concerned, little practical interest in the question whether the essentially uniform mental "outfit" of mankind is variable, and if so, whether any variation is likely to be slow or quick. However, the question of physical modifications may be important for our study of the mental problems if it is concerned with this point whether considerable variations, such as have taken place in historical times, indicate a change of race or a variation in the same race owing to environment.

We shall therefore merely touch upon the great controversial matter of modern biology, namely whether variations in species and in races are brought about through selection of variations in the germ-cells (Weissmann), or whether by changes in organs, effected by direct natural influences (Geoffroy), or by the use or neglect of the organs (Lamarck). Lamarck's statement on the inheritance of acquired characteristics naturally supports the view that racial types change very quickly, while mere selection would need a long time to bring about such changes. Race theorists are almost all of the opinion that racial characteristics do not change under the influence of environment, but certainly do change through the dying out of unadapted types, and the survival of those which adapt themselves. According to a remarkable theory of Lapouge it is not only the natural, but also the social environment that is selective and that therefore social conditions further the survival or the dying out of certain types. Biological research during the last few decades has confirmed to a large extent the theory that acquired characteristics are not transmitted by heredity. Yet the problem is far from being settled. Even in the field of natural science critical

investigators have put forth grave objections to one-sided selectionism, and have found it insufficient to explain the evolution of species.⁷ The exaggerated emphasis on the invariability of race by extreme Mendelians, on the one hand, and on the other hand, the view of de Vries, that great differences in type have come about by leaps (mutations), have for some time even cast doubts upon the idea of evolution, that basic principle of modern scientific thought. But it is precisely in the crossing of races, that is in the combination anew of the relatively persistent individual characteristics, and in the mutation effected in the germ-cell by the influence of environment, that recent Mendelian thought discovers ways towards the more rapid evolution of new forms. The essence of Lamarck's principle, which, as a matter of fact, Darwin himself never rejected, is now adopted in a purified form and supported by representative authorities with strong evidence. Stockbreeders who can draw upon the accumulated experiences of generations believe firmly in the inheritance of acquired characteristics, as well-known experts confirm.⁸ Kohlbrugge says that practically all anthropologists of to-day are Lamarckians and not Darwinians. Moreover, biological experiments carried out of late seem to provide strong proof of a modified Lamarckian standpoint. Various animals were placed under abnormal conditions and subjected to extreme heat or cold, moisture or dryness, light or darkness, changed diet and so on. Distinct variations from the normal type resulted; and by means of light, heat, and moisture, changes were effected in butterflies and in other animals corresponding to those observed in hot regions. In many cases these acquired characteristics seem to have been inherited even after the restoration of normal conditions.

Paul Kammerer placed salamanders with yellow and black spots, some on a yellow and some on a black background. The salamanders became in one case predominantly yellow, in the other predominantly black, and their offspring retained these variations, even although changed to a different background. Other experimenters have succeeded in changing the instincts of invertebrates and insects, achieving, for instance, a change in the instinct for food, the manner of laying eggs, the chrysalis stage, the brood-instinct, and so on—a change so persevering that it seems to have been inherited even when the modifying conditions were absent. (Schroeder, Pictet, etc.)

As to the implications of some of these results of experiments, there are still differences of opinion. Many biologists assume that only great variations in the germ-cell (mutations) can become the

starting point of new races, but even such mutation in the germ cell must be in the end traceable to the influence of environment ; and the rest of the body, whose sensitiveness to environment has never been questioned, constitutes " environment " for the germ cell. Finally, the fact must be mentioned that a great influence has been ascribed of late to the inner secretions with respect to the development of human characteristics.⁹

However, it cannot be expected that human forms should adapt themselves in the shortest space of time to changed conditions, for man cannot be submitted to the simple conditions of an experiment. With regard to the colonization of land overseas, the settlement of Negroes in North America, etc., our experience reaches only a few generations back, since it seems that the number of Europeans in the tropics must be continually kept up by reinforcements from the home countries, while Negro slaves, owing to the small number of women among them, and to sterility induced by promiscuity, etc., increased only slowly and had to be continually imported anew. There are certain evidences, however, that in the case of pure-blooded Europeans who have lived for generations in the tropics (Creoles) a distinct change in type takes place. It must not be forgotten, too, that the European who goes to the tropics to a great extent takes his European environment and habit of life with him ; he is by no means so much exposed to natural conditions as are the natives. Nevertheless, the disadvantages involved in his lack of adaptation often expresses itself in an increased mortality.¹⁰ It has often been asserted that in the tropics European races can stay permanently only by mingling with the natives, that is by acquiring some of the natural adaptability of the indigenous people.

Kollmann, who represents the standpoint that racial characteristics have not changed at least since the Diluvium¹¹ (perhaps for ten thousand years), explains it in the following way : " If man ever since the Diluvium has escaped the influence of a law of nature which inevitably affects all other beings, the reason for this is to be found in the fact that he can overcome disadvantages of geographical conditions by procuring an artificial climate. This he does by means of clothing, of shelter, of food, which latter with the help of fire he makes easily assimilable for his organism, so that in all latitudes he lives under conditions not widely dissimilar." This " artificial " climate may be compared to the domestication of animals, which has induced in them considerable changes in addition to those resulting from selection. The transition from wild

to tame life seems to favour strong variations as also does cross-breeding. Even the older anthropologists (John Hunter, Prichard) observed that on becoming tame plants and animals lose their dark colour, and they have made use of this fact to explain the appearance of lighter colouring among men. Of late this view has been supported in detail by Eugen Fischer, who compares other racial features of mankind with phenomena appearing among domesticated animals.¹²

Natural conditions, geological and climatic environment, the topography of the mainland, the distribution of plants and animals, in many parts of the world were once very different from what they are now.¹³ Thus, in our part of the world a tropical or warm climate has alternated with ice-ages. Penka and Moritz Wagner first put forward the theory that the Aryan race, and especially the Germans, were a product of selection during the ice-age. Further, in those ancient times men lived in smaller groups isolated from each other by wide spaces, and all this favoured the development of a fixed type. Thus it was that in the long course of millenniums certain racial features could be developed and become fixed in a race, while we to-day, in conditions which are wholly different, can no longer discover the origin of these features. If this isolation had continued without any break at all mankind might have split up into quite different species. But great climatic changes compelled men to seek repeatedly a new habitat where food could be more easily obtained and this occasioned numerous folk migrations, involving race mingling. It seems that this process of isolation with the development of a pure stock alternated many times with migrations and minglings.

Johann von Ranke has shown how great an influence upon the body is exercised by social conditions of life.¹⁴ The most general law of growth is to the effect that those organs are most developed which are used the most. Primitive man, who very often has to carry on a very acute struggle for existence, stands, as far as proportions of the body are concerned, closest to the workman member of the civilized races, and furthest away from the men-apes, to which class those who do no physical work (e.g. men of learning) are the nearest. Ranke, in recapitulating, states that the differences in the physical proportions themselves are very slight, and between the individual races are no more marked than between different social types of one race. They certainly do not warrant the deduction that primitive peoples are on a lower level.

SKULL FORMATION

For a long time race theorists thought that they could take the skull-index—that is the relation between the length and breadth of the skull—as the criterion of racial capacity for civilization. Thus Chamberlain spoke of the long German skull, “which an eternally pulsing brain agitated by ardent longing hammers out in front well beyond the circle of animal inertia.” But the Negroes, Australians, gypsies, Eskimos, etc., have, as a matter of fact, the long skull, while the great majority of Germans, especially the peoples of cultured South Germany, as well as other civilized peoples, possess broad skulls. Anthropology to-day has quite given up the idea that the long skull betokens a nobler form of intelligence. Numerous attempts to discover another index with which to measure the natural talents have produced no result.¹⁵

In the face of many former doubts (Nyström, Jørgensen, and others), it is assumed to-day, practically without exception, that skull formation is a racial characteristic and is inherited. However, external influences before, at, and after birth, as well as conditions of life, may change the form of the skull, so that the skull-index can give no sure guidance with regard to the race of an individual.¹⁶

Prominent among the great store of data bearing upon the distribution of skull forms three facts stand out: first, the round-head in the course of history supplants the long-head nearly everywhere; secondly, mountain-dwellers are predominantly round-headed; thirdly, in many parts city dwellers seem more usually to have long heads than country dwellers.¹⁷ The question challenges our attention because these displacements have caused very far-reaching interpretations as regards mental capacity of races.

The race theorists link the first two facts together in their explanation. They assume that originally a round-headed race occupied the whole land, then that they had to some extent retired to the mountains before the advance of the conquering long-heads who were unable to follow them into their fastnesses. As time went on, however, the noble long-heads were much reduced in number owing to over-indulgence of their warlike propensities and were outnumbered in the lowlands again by the prolific short-heads, who had survived as a subject race. The dolichocephalic tendency of cities (which, as a matter of fact, is doubtful) they explain by a kind of natural selection, indicating that the long-heads being more active mentally seek to leave the country and the less favourable

places and to go into the cities.¹⁸ This self selection must, of course, contribute to the fact that the unfruitful territories, mountains, etc., whence the stream of emigration is strong, must show an ever-rising index, since only the duller people, the broad-heads, remain behind. The wearing struggle for existence in the cities more and more makes inroads upon the noble northern long-heads. Lapouge, Ammon, Beddoe, and others think this very ominous for the future. However, their conclusions would be quite invalid if perhaps there were no question whatever of the displacement of one race by another, but only of the change wrought by environment in one particular race.

This is what the environment theorists assert. They explain that it is improbable that long-heads should everywhere have followed short-heads. They think it much more likely that, owing to external or internal influences, the long-head changed into a short-head. Ranke most of all has stood for the view that mountain conditions exercise a direct influence. It is believed that the broad skull depends on a broad chest, which is an accompaniment of mountain life, so that the narrow form characteristic of cities may be explained in connexion with the narrowing of the chest. Johannsen has pointed out the connexion between long-headedness and stature.¹⁹ Further, a connexion is assumed between the increase of brachycephaly on the one hand, and on the other better nourishment, the change to lighter, more vegetable and more easily masticated food, the use of milk, etc., and especially the development of the brain corresponding to an increase in mental activity. The results of animal breeding experiments support the hypothesis that food has an influence. Lissauer described how experiments on pigs and wolves have demonstrated that better nourishment produces a broadening and heightening of the skull. Further, Ivanovsky, after a protracted series of measurements, has found that the influence of the last great famine in Russia has manifested itself in definite changes in physical proportions, in the skull formation, in pigmentation, and in the inner secretions. The "invariableness of the anthropological type" he calls a myth, and emphasizes the "complete power of the influence of environment."²⁰

Regnault, Nyström, and others explain the long-headed characteristics as an accompaniment of the development of the neck muscles through certain occupations and much stooping. With the progressive atrophy of the neck muscles owing to their lack of exercise the skull becomes flattened and often highly brachycephalic. The long-headed characteristics of the lower races

are perhaps a result of the drag of the heavy frontal parts of their skulls, and similar characteristics manifested in cities probably a result of the predominantly bent attitude common in the schools and at work, etc.²¹

Thomson thinks that long spines and prominent cheek bones, the usual characteristics of less civilized peoples living on coarse food, induce long-headedness. Pittard believes that the long-headed tendency of the cities is a result of taller stature. Rickets which affect almost a third of all city children, often causes skull deformation, since the fontanel remains open so long and the bones are so soft that they are affected by the pressure caused by lying. A disposition to rickets is perhaps inheritable.²²

Nyström has demonstrated the necessary preconditions of a change in skull formation, and also that after the closing of the cranial sutures the skull remains for a long time capable of extension, through the reabsorption of masses of bone on the inner surface as well as the depositing of new material on the outer surface.²³ As Nyström has shown by experiment, the growth of the brain and the blood pressure which is increased by mental effort, tends, according to Pascal's principle, to broaden out the skull. As a matter of fact, Nyström found by the measurement of five hundred Swedes belonging to a very dolichocephalic Germanic race, that the higher and cultured classes have a much larger brachycephalic percentage than the lower and less cultured. Further, Nyström established the fact that brachycephalics cross over from the lower to the higher classes in far greater numbers; of course, it is also possible to say that it is owing to this transition that they become brachycephalic. According to the race theories it is precisely these higher classes which should manifest the nobler Germanic dolichocephalic form, an idea which is hereby contradicted. As we shall point out later, great men are often strikingly brachycephalic. Other investigations, however, seem to indicate that the skulls of cultured people tend rather towards length than breadth.²⁴

The richest material with regard to the distribution of skull formations in Europe is contained in Ripley's great work.²⁵ The connexion between mountain conditions and round-headedness seems to be supported not only with data from a large part of Europe, but also by the extreme brachycephalic characteristics so common on the Himalayan Plateau, and among the Andes and the Rocky Mountains (p. 52). On the other hand, in the Zillertal, Iseltal, and Kalseetal (valleys in the Tyrol), the heights show more

long-heads than the valleys (p. 292). Ripley explains this by saying that during the period of folk-migrations the invading broad-headed Slavs pushed the long-headed Germans into the inaccessible heights. The Basques living in the Pyrenees are long-headed, those who live on the plains of France are broad-headed (p. 192). The Highlanders of Scotland are extremely long-headed, very tall and of light pigmentation. The very pronounced broad-headedness in Russia cannot be accounted for by the influence of intellectual work, of mountain conditions, or of rich food. The Anglo-Saxons and the Mediterranean peoples, all of them highly developed, are very long-headed. The short-statured Germanic stocks of North Italy, retaining to this day German customs and language (*Sette comuni*) have taken on the Alpine round-head, and are also otherwise indistinguishable from other Italians (p. 235). On the other hand, the region round Lucca shows pronounced long-headedness quite out of keeping with that environment (p. 259). The mountain Albanians, who, four hundred years ago, settled in Apulia, have retained their comparative blondness and their round-heads in a very long-headed environment (p. 414).²⁶ Perhaps the form of the skull in certain conditions is more easily acquired than lost? Ripley in answer to Ranke declares that he himself has demonstrated in the case of children in factories how bad food causes a narrowing of the skull (by hindering the growth of the temples) which is in contradiction to the explanation that the Alpine skull formation is due to scarcity of food. Buch, on the contrary, declares that the tendency of the West Finns towards long-headedness is most decidedly to be ascribed to their food, which is better than that of the broad-headed Lapps. Deniker points out that the broader skulls are to be found in Central Europe among the mountains, and in South Europe on the plains.²⁷

Thus the problem is far from being solved. Franz Boas has published very striking investigations concerning the change in the skull-index of the children of immigrants into America. These give strong support to the contention that environment has a rapid influence upon skull formation.²⁸ Eugen Fischer maintains, too, that a modification of skull formation by environment is probable, and cites an interesting example (the great Walser Valley, Vorarlberg). Martin (p. 688), on the other hand, assumes that modifications of skull formation are in the first place due to changes in the composition of the race, and only to a slight extent to the influence of environment.

PHYSICAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN

FACIAL BONES

All race theories make much of facial features, believing that the character and capacity of the mind are revealed in them. But the formation of the facial features is subject to external influences ; especially important are the chewing apparatus and the way of chewing, as Engel, Langer, Virchow, and others have pointed out.²⁹ Primitive man, who has to make coarse and tough food assimilable with his teeth, will show the traces of that in his face.

The most striking feature of the facial outline—often used as a proof of the likeness of the lower races to animals—is the prognathous form caused by a protruding jaw. This may be common in lower races, but it is not unknown among the higher stocks. The difference consists only in the frequency. Kollmann, commenting on a table of Welcker which sets forth the degree in which this prognathous form occurs in the various peoples, says³⁰ : “ The Neo-Italians bear its stamp, the Dutch must cheerfully see themselves bracketed with the Brazilians and the Hottentots, and immediately before the world-conquering heroes of ancient Rome march the Eskimos, all branded as long-heads. In the ranks of the broad-heads the groupings are no less strange ; so far as the noble position of the jaw is concerned, the Tartars and the Kalmucks far surpass the Germans and the Italians, and the latter find themselves in disconcerting proximity to the Alfurus, for only two decimal points separate them.” Prognathous forms are to be found among the skulls of the Germanic race-migration period. Kollmann compares them with some Papuan skulls and cites a Germanic skull which is fully 8 per cent more prognathous than the Papuan skull. According to measurements made by Welcker of the skulls of thirty normal men of German origin, 43 per cent turned out to be prognathous. The two lowest skulls were still more prognathous than the average of five Australian aborigines measured by Welcker. A German anatomist arranged a group of skulls to represent various races, choosing them from his own anatomical collection of German skulls. Experts on encountering this curiosity have been unable to contain their surprise at typical Negro and Indian skull forms which the environment of Goettingen provided.³¹ In Europe, too, the prognathous form seems more frequently to appear in connexion with long-heads than with broad-heads. According to Kollmann (p. 101) the brachycephalic and dark-skinned people in Europe had a more noble facial angle than the fair long-heads. Kollmann concludes : “ Nobody will deny that among the coloured and the

light-skinned people the most pronounced differences in the facial angles are to be observed, and yet I know no characteristic which is not also to be found among the civilized peoples," a statement which will later be shown to hold true, especially of the nose. Virchow has repeatedly declared ³² that even the most practised craniologist cannot with certainty assign to any race a skull of whose history he knows nothing. It is therefore only a typical example of the ignorance prevailing in certain circles of Germany when a well-known professor of philosophy writes: "If the mark of my German race were not plain to anyone at the first glance, I should feel that I was a poor creature and that really I had been treated by Mother Nature in a step-motherly fashion. Indeed, if after generations my skull should roll to the feet of an anthropologist, it would surely grin with scorn at him as a bungler in his profession, if he did not at once recognize in it the German skull." ³³

FACIAL FEATURES

With regard to this part also of the human physiognomy, individual features which are regarded as racial characteristics are to be found in all races.³⁴ The slit eyes of the Mongol are known to be caused by the presence of the Mongolian fold. Ranke and Drews have indicated its occurrence in the indigenous Bavarian population of Munich. Among the adults, both men and women, about 12 per cent on an average, among infants up to 6 months of age 33 per cent, show distinctly the Mongolian fold. A very pronounced development of it was found in 1 per cent and in 6 per cent of these cases respectively. Eugen Fischer regards the Mongolian fold and the Mongolian spot as resulting from the Mongolian admixture in the stock of Europe.

With regard to the soft parts of the face, another transforming feature must be considered which cannot enter into play upon other organs, namely that of imitation. Virchow draws attention to this problem declaring that besides the influences of the chewing muscles upon the face, "yet another influence is certainly in operation, the meaning of which is best illustrated by the Jewish race. I mean the physiognomic influence which is effected chiefly through the muscles, especially through the mimic muscles. The difference between German, English, Spanish, and Polish Jews is due not to the increased mixing of stocks alone, though this also is certainly one of the causes, but much more to the imitation and the adaptation of the muscle positions and muscle movements in popular prototypes. To try to discover how far the mimic muscles are able

to determine the formation of the facial bones would be a new task which has not yet been tackled, and which I should like all the more to emphasize here in the *Crania Ethnica Americana*, since America constitutes the accepted field for all investigations into the possible transformation of local race characteristics."

In the same way Bagehot says of America that a rather phlegmatic Englishman takes on the alert American look in a few years; an Irishman or a German adopts it likewise.³⁵ Dilke believed that it is certain that the English families who have been for a long time in the country manifest the facial features of the extirpated (Indian) race. However, this statement, which is often made, is sometimes contradicted, for example, by Ripley.³⁶ McDougall also has doubts, yet he gives some evidence for the transformation of the white race in America which according to him may perhaps be explained by an admixture of Indian blood and by the "dominance" of certain Indian characters. In the case of Australia, he believes in a change of the type of the whites. Jewish families which left the ghetto several generations ago and belong to the better classes everywhere bear some resemblance to the other people of the class to which they belong. Men who know the Jews well, like Zangwill and Bloch, confirm the existence of these tendencies in various lands; and especially strong in support are the investigations of Fischberg,³⁷ which culminate in the statement that the Jewish type is to a great extent a social type conditioned by the history and the way of life of the Jews. In China the Jews are hardly to be distinguished from the Chinese, in Africa they resemble the Negroes, in Germanic North Europe they look like the Nordic type, in Russia the Russian, as one may see from many good portraits collected by Fischberg. It is a great mistake to imagine that the Jew of the comic paper is the most widespread type; in the natural course of events he is as seldom to be found as the officer or the professor of caricature. In the case of the majority of the cultured and wealthy Jews in lands where there is a strain of dark colour, even a good observer will be unable with certainty to identify the stock by means of outward appearance. Of course, racial mingling also comes into play.

As Buntaro Adachi remarks, the Europeans in Japan take on Japanese features,³⁸ and Japanese who have lived for long in Europe adapt themselves in the same way. Gützlaff on his return from China was quite Chinese. Lamer lately told of two pure-blooded North German families whose children, brought up in China, became like the Chinese, showing slightly slit eyes, etc.³⁹ In the same way reports show that sometimes Europeans tend also to resemble the Indian

and the Australian types. There is abundant evidence, too, that primitive peoples placed in proximity to European culture take on European features, so that in many cases they cannot be distinguished from Europeans.⁴⁰ Schopenhauer remarks that the nobles did not belong to the people, they were the same type all over the world. Emerson says ⁴¹: "Each religious sect has its physiognomy. The Methodists have acquired a face, the Quakers a face, the nuns a face. An Englishman will pick out a Dissenter by his manners. Trades and professions leave their own lines on face and form." It is difficult to disentangle physiognomic judgments from national prejudices and traditional ideals of beauty, consequently they are uncertain elements. Thus many Japanese and many Jews are, according to Nordic standards, far from good looking; this, however, has nothing at all to do with their mental and spiritual life and their cultural importance. The Japanese have not only adopted European culture in the shortest time, but have also considerably enriched it, scientifically and artistically, while the Germanic peoples needed more than one thousand years to assimilate the ancient culture. The "highly gifted" Mandingo are among the most ill-favoured of the Negroes. The Kroo-Negroes in spite of their lower facial type and their striking ugliness are indispensable to European trade. On the other hand, very savage races have so-called noble features resembling very often in a most surprising way the Caucasian type.⁴² It is said that the Kurds differ so slightly from the Nordic peoples, especially the Germans, in colour of eyes, skin, and hair, that they may be easily mistaken for Germans. Yet they are a wild marauding people, and their cultural level has not changed essentially since the days of Xenophon.

BRAIN

Variations in the capacities of races for mental development must in the first place be traceable in the brain. Numerous investigations have shown that many primitive peoples, at least on the average, possess a smaller skull-content, or have a brain which weighs less than the European. However, it must be noted in this connexion that the size of the brain is related to the stature or, indeed, the size of the whole body. A comparison, therefore, which does not take into account the different statures of different peoples has no value. The small Japanese has certainly a smaller brain volume than the big Patagonian—but what a difference there is in the mental development! It would therefore be quite wrong if

one were to draw far-reaching conclusions, for example, from the many tables comparing small races like the Bushmen, Waddahs, Andamanese, etc., with tall races. According to Welcker, the difference between the skull content of most Europeans and Negroes should be about 100 cubic centimetres, according to Morton 170 cubic centimetres, to Waldeyer 155 cubic centimetres. Between the male and the female of the same race, on the other hand, the difference is, for England 203 cubic centimetres, for Paris 221; among Europeans in general, according to Waldeyer, 185, and to Fischer and Mollison 150 cubic centimetres. Among the same European peoples, says Matiegka, the higher official or doctor has 90 grams more brain weight than the labourer—that is about 100 cubic centimetres, which represents the difference between Europeans and Negroes (according to Welcker). *The differences between the size of the brain of Negroes and that of white people are therefore no greater and sometimes even smaller than the differences between white men and women, between educated and uneducated!* These differences are obviously due partly to selection, partly to practice; precisely as the smith has stronger muscles and the educated man in general has a more developed brain. Of course, there are exceptions; individual geniuses have had very small brains (e.g. Leibniz and Schiller), and the heaviest brain known so far (2,850 grams) was that of an imbecile.

According to Martin's tables (p. 642), East Asiatics, Polynesians, Indians, Kaffirs, Cameroons have about as much brain as the average European (1,450 ccm.); indeed, the Javanese (with 1,510 ccm.) have even more,⁴³ and the under-sized Eskimos (with 1,563 ccm.) surpass the average European by the same amount as the latter surpasses the less developed Negro (1,330 ccm.).⁴⁴ Even the extremely small and uncivilized Bushmen (with 1,324 ccm.) are very little behind the Negroes. Races which are unusually small have, of course, a small brain, yet one of these, the Hindus for example (admittedly a highly civilized people), stand between the Weddahs and the Andamanese—two of the lowest races. The smallest brain content is found in the Australians and the Papuans, who on the average equal European women. Within the race group of highest stature it is not always the most developed mentally which have the largest brain; among Europeans, for instance, the Auvergnats and the Basques top the list, while the Tyrolese are placed very close to the Negroes. According to Fischer and Mollison the mean brain weight of a man among the Chinese works out at 1,428 grams, among Europeans 1,361 grams,⁴⁵ Negroes

1,316 grams, Australians, Weddahs, and Bushmen 1,200-900 grams. Consequently, if brain weight were to be the index of higher mental gifts, then the Chinese would be as far ahead of Europeans as these are ahead of Negroes! Also the assertion so frequently made that the brain of the Negro is not capable of development because as a result of earlier puberty the cranial-sutures close earlier has been shown to be groundless.⁴⁶

Another position put forward is that racial characteristics manifest themselves in the structure rather than in the weight of the brain. But here, too, research has arrived at an opposite conclusion. In the first place a larger brain, for purely mechanical reasons, must have more convolutions.⁴⁷ Besides, the individual variations are very pronounced, so that even Eugen Fischer, who firmly believes in mental differences between races, points out that "absolutely no racial differences can be found" (*Erblichkeitslehre*, p. 95). Stieda, Buschan, Kollmann, Topinard, Landau, Poynter, and others arrive likewise at negative conclusions. Kohlbrügge investigated⁴⁸ the brains of 130 South Sea Islanders with the greatest thoroughness, and the results he arrived at smash the racial theory altogether. Absolute racial characteristics, he says, do not exist in the brain; differences in the frequency of certain variations are very improbable, and racial diagnoses are out of the question. The same investigator says⁴⁹ that after very detailed investigations carried on for years in dissecting rooms in the Dutch East Indies *it was not possible to establish the slightest difference* between the brain of an aborigine and that of a European. The same holds true also for other anatomical relationships. Mall reached the same conclusion after investigating the brains of ten Europeans and Negroes. There was no difference discoverable, either with regard to the size of the brain or the number of convolutions. Hrdlicka examined the brain of a 45-year-old Eskimo and found it heavier than that of a European of equal stature. The number, the extent, and the depth of the convolutions were more than in the case of the average white man. In examining three more brains he found similar results. Virchow, having examined some Tierra del Fuegians, usually regarded as the lowest of all races, draws attention to the remarkable size of their skulls and Martin says, with regard to the weight of their brain: "Taken absolutely, this weight places the Pescherah, who are described as half animals, beside the European, and relatively to their bodily size the relationship is rather in their favour." "With regard to the type of convolution," says Seitz, "the brains are on the same level as those of ordinary Europeans."

Jacob examined the brains of four Tierra del Fuegians and Araucanians, and arrived at the conclusion that they "are absolutely on the same level as the average developed brain of Europeans." ⁵⁰ Kollmann absolutely rejects the idea that racial differences exist in the brain. Bolk examined the brain of a Papuan, and while it was found to have few convolutions, it manifested "no phenomenon in the system of branching which had not yet been discovered in the European brain". The investigations of Sergi on the brains of Hereroes produced similar results.

COLOUR OF SKIN, HAIR, AND EYES

Since the earliest times no racial characteristic has attracted so much attention nor given rise to so many attempted explanations as pigmentation, which conditions the colour of skin, hair, and eyes. According to the popular conception, differences of colouring clearly reveal deep and essential differences among men. The leaning towards symbolization sees in a dark pigmentation of the skin the sign of a dark soul life, which can never rise to the bright heights attained by the white race. As a matter of fact, no one will say that an essential and unbridgeable gulf exists between red and blue sweet peas, or between white horses and roan. In the case of human beings, however, quite trifling differences in degree are sufficient to originate the most absurd prejudices of race. ⁵¹ Here, however, it is always a question only of differences of degree. The microscope shows that the manifold varieties of pigmentation in the human race are caused by the accumulation and distribution of different quantities of the same pigment. ⁵²

The granular pigment possesses a yellow brown colour, and gives rise to all shades from "white" to "dark brown". But even the lightest coloured European has pigment and belongs really to the yellow race; and this is the more evident especially in corpses, whose colour is not affected by the action of the blood coursing beneath the surface of the skin. Poverty of pigment, in general, manifests itself in the allied phenomena of light hair, light skin, and light eyes. The origin of pigment, in spite of eagerly pursued research, has not been wholly accounted for. Nevertheless, a certain connexion between the strength of the pigment and the climate is so strikingly obvious that it has been noticed since the earliest times. For a long time the dark colour of the southern races has been ascribed to the heat of the homeland, but the greatest heat and the deepest black colour do not coincide; the people of

the Polar regions are also dark-skinned ; and very often neighbouring races or races in the same latitude show the greatest divergencies. It seems likely that the moisture of the air also plays its part. To-day, however, it is the rays of light with their chemical effects and not the rays of heat which are regarded as the chief element in the formation of pigment.⁵³ Pigment is an essential protective means against the harmful consequences of severe exposure to light.

According to generally accepted experiences it is precisely the dark colour which absorbs the warm rays better ; at the same time it is impenetrable to the chemical rays, and besides that the accumulated pigment causes a stronger transpiration, owing to which the skin of the Negro is always damp, and this, too, modifies the effect of the heat. With astonishment travellers point out that the Negro prefers to lie uncovered in the hottest sunshine, often for hours at a time, while the European would get sunstroke from ten minutes of it. Schmaedel⁵⁴ has shown experimentally that these chemically active rays operate through several layers of clothing, and even through the bones. A similar view has been taken by C. E. Woodruff, while observations made in the Philippines by various investigators seem to contradict the theory of the injurious effect of the chemically active rays.

Besides this, it must be remembered that the pigment wanders, and that therefore various causes may well give rise to considerable accumulations of pigment precisely in places where pigment does not originate. As a result of the undoubted protective effect of pigment, the origin of the dark coloured races can easily be explained by adaptation and selection. The question whether lack of pigment is an advantage in a temperate climate is a more difficult one. It may well be that the dark skin is more easily acquired than lost. On these grounds Buffon and Blumenbach held that white was the original colour of mankind. Yet a mass of evidence supports the statement that in a temperate climate the Negro becomes toned down a little in colour. Singular individuals become in a short time as light skinned as to resemble Europeans suffering slightly from jaundice.⁵⁵ It seems that there are regions which without suffering especially from lack of light yet favour a pathological lack of pigment (albinism).⁵⁶ Different individuals possess in varying degree the capacity of developing pigment ; only in those who are wholly Albinos it is quite absent. Among the white peoples brunettes take on brown pigmentation much more quickly and more completely than fair people. Virchow reports that in six weeks in Egypt he

became just as brown as the Fellahin. His skin was by nature of a yellowish tinge. Many people think that for these reasons the brunettes of Europe are to be regarded as the toned-down descendants of a dark-skinned race. Negro children at birth are as light skinned as South Europeans (Italians or Greeks) and take on their dark colouring after the lapse of some weeks. According to the fundamental law of phylogenetics, therefore, the dark skin of the Negro would need to be regarded as a characteristic acquired in the course of evolution. In the case of yellow or brown races the influence of exposure to weak or to strong sunshine is very marked. The higher classes and the women are often lighter in colour; those who work in the sun much darker. Egyptian and Cretan pictures, therefore, show women much lighter in colour. The fact is also important that the lighter yellow-pigmented Hottentots and Bushmen of South Africa are much more affected by the rigours of the climate than the darker-skinned Negroes.⁵⁷ Both these peoples therefore smear themselves with fat and soot, obviously as a substitute for the natural pigment. Many other African peoples and also Polar peoples have the same custom. This artificial pigmentation has given rise to many false arguments and data about the colouring of races. Tourists make use of the same means and protect themselves from the strong rays of the sun and the ice by smearing themselves with fat and soot.⁵⁸

It has often been asked why the Red Indians are of a lighter colour than Negroes living in the same latitude. The fact is that the Red Indians are not red, nor the Negroes black; it is a question of various shades of yellow and brown.⁵⁹ The dark brown Negro is by no means the rule. For the most part Negroes do not manifest a darker colour than the Indians occasionally show. America reaches north and south much further than Africa does. The continual migrations may have brought about a levelling of the racial peculiarities. It is remarkable how often we hear of very light-skinned South American Indians whose pigmentation is just like that of Spaniards, Portuguese, or even Germans, without a word being said about the possibility of racial mingling.⁶⁰

Virchow designates as dirty fellows the North American Indians whom he examined, and remarks that their colour is very far from being the red copper colour usually ascribed to them in pictures. Prichard first explained the lighter colouring of the Indians in comparison with that of Negroes by connecting it with the fact that America was so closely wooded. It is a fact that in the same latitude the great forests of the Amazon and the Orinoco occur in America

along with the darkest coloured Negroes in Africa. From all parts of the world reports come to the effect that forest-life produces a lighter colour of skin. In Africa, too, the light-skinned dwarf peoples,⁶¹ who are of a yellow colour, are found in the virgin forests of the Congo in the immediate vicinity of the Equator. In this case it is not only the effect of forest shade which must be considered, but also the fact that the green colour of the foliage greedily absorbs the chemical rays. Everybody knows that tired eyes are refreshed by looking at a green surface. Jackmann asserts that pigmentation forms a strong protection against certain microbes connected with chemical rays, and that this fact explains the immunity which the natives enjoy with regard to certain infections. The various race colourings, therefore, are to be explained as the result of a selective process under the combined influence of micro-organisms and light rays.⁶²

A strong proof of the theory that racial colourings originate in local adaptation is provided by the noticeable agreement in this respect among men, animals, and plants. Under the influence of this strong tropical sun and the hot moist climate every living thing takes on a more intensive colouring,⁶³ and the same holds good on high mountains.

The colour of the hair changes throughout the whole human race in varying degrees of brown, red hair being an exception. At the same time in individuals the colour of the hair changes with age. Children in New Guinea have at first light golden red hair, which later becomes brown or black. Negro children, too, have at first chestnut-brown silken hair, which only later becomes curly. Most of the children in the temperate zone are born blonde and become dark by degrees. Pfitzner points out⁶⁴ that the colour of the hair becomes constant only after forty years of age, when it can be referred to as a racial characteristic. The Australians, who stand so low in the human scale, have often fine silky wavy hair forming beautiful curls.

THE ILLUSION OF PURE RACIAL TYPES: RACIAL MINGLING

The difficulty involved in the question of the division of races is increased if several characteristics instead of individual ones be considered, for the most various combinations occur. Otto Ammon,⁶⁵ himself one of the keenest apostles of the race theory, in a most interesting way, and with the help of the theory of probabilities, has shown how slight the probability is of finding a

pure racial type in one of the mixed peoples. If we suppose that two races, *A* and *B*, have been mixed together in the proportion of two-thirds to one-third, then (provided that no artificial limitation has intervened) the number of pure racial types of *A* and *B* after *N* generations will be $(\frac{2}{3})^{2n}$ and $(\frac{1}{3})^{2n}$ respectively. As early as in the fourth generation those who are mixtures will amount to 96 per cent, and in five generations to practically 100 per cent of the people. Ammon's conclusions are : in a people which has been mixed for 300 years, there are no individuals, or only very few and far between, of pure unmixed race ; such individuals are possibly a little more numerous in the more exclusive classes which have a purer racial descent and prohibit marriage with lower classes. If certain anthropologists believe they have discovered individuals of pure race in a mixed population (so called types), this is an illusion. It would be just as good to take any partial combination of characteristics and with them as basis select a certain number of crosses and call them types. As a matter of fact, why should a man with fine blonde hair, blue eyes, a long skull, but "Mongolian" cheek-bones, or a "Semitic" nose be regarded as less of a cross than one with Germanic "normal" features but black hair and a round skull ? Of course, relatively pure types do occur, especially because traditional limitations very often hinder free and complete mingling.

The latest researches into heredity show, further, that in the case of crosses, as a matter of fact, a kind of "sorting out" of the cross-characteristics takes place in which the individual traits (not the total type) once more become separated out ; for example, a mean colour resulting from crossing resolves itself once more, in the case of offspring, into its primary colours. Further, since many characteristics seem to be dominant (e.g. dark colours over lighter colours), it is assumed that the grafting of a dark type is sufficient to cause a people predominantly fair to become dark,⁶⁶ and then such a people would become "suppressed" blondes. At the same time it is sometimes asserted that, for instance, in South America, a Negro element in a light coloured population has been wholly assimilated in several generations, so that it can no longer be recognized. In this case, therefore, it would be the light characteristics which are dominant.

The problem arises in connexion with this question, whether through crossings new race types arise, or merely a mosaic of different characteristics, of which new combinations are repeatedly reproduced, without a complete unification being achieved. Many

observations support this last assumption, for instance, Luschan's researches in Asia Minor, those of Eugen Fischer among the mixed peoples of South-West Africa, etc. According to the results of experimental racial crossings, carried out in plants and animals, it ought to be clear that in the course of a long period of racial crossing and adaptation to environment a uniform type must develop. The Spanish people, for example, seem to manifest a similarity of form in spite of their being historically very much mixed. Especially striking and obvious are the numerous race-crossings in Egypt, where the most ancient monuments illustrate wonderfully the differences among the racial types. Yet the Egyptian population to-day manifests a very great uniformity of type, and gives no indication of the many racial crossings mentioned in history. This has been established by Charles Myers on the basis of detailed measurements, and, as he says, in opposition to the opinion which he himself originally held.⁶⁷

NOTES TO CHAPTER II

¹ Cf. Kant, *Von den verschiedenen Racen der Menschen*, 1775; *Bestimmung des Begriffes einer Menschenrace*, 1785; and *Ueber den Gebrauch teleologischer Prinzipien in der Philosophie*, 1788, in I. Kant's works (Hartenstein), 1839, vol. x.

² Cf. W. Schmidt, *Die moderne Ethnologie* (Afth., 1906, i), pp. 320, 332, 356 seq.

³ *Anthropologie*, edited by Schwalbe and Fischer, 1923, p. 122. Rudolf Martin, *Lehrbuch der Anthropologie*, 1914, restricts anthropology to merely physical phenomena.

⁴ From a historical point of view, cf. J. C. Prichard, *Researches into the Physical History of Men*, 1836, bk. ii, and Darwin, *Origin of Species* (in his works, 1875, vol. v); there are, besides, many modern books on the matter.

⁵ J. H. F. Kohlbrugge, *Die morphologische Abstammung des Menschen*, 1908.

⁶ Cf. especially J. v. Ranke, "Ueber die individuellen Variationen im Schädelbau des Menschen" (*Kbl.*, 1897). Similar views have been expressed by Kollmann, Klaatsch, Kohlbrugge, Stratz, Mehring, Aeby, Snell, Bolsche, van den Broek.

⁷ Cf. a good survey in A. Wagner, *Geschichte des Lamarckismus als Einführung in die psychobiologische Bewegung der Gegenwart*, 1909; Hugo Iltis; G. J. Mendel, *Leben, Werk und Wirkung*, 1924, pp. 344-73. For the following, cf. Paul Kammrercr, *Allgemeine Biologie*, 2nd edition, 1920; Richard Semon, *Das Problem der Vererbung erworbener Eigenschaften*, 1913; Przibram, *Experimentalzoologie*, 1910, vol. iii; Lehmann, *Experimentelle Abstammungs- und Vererbungslehre*, 1913; Julius Bauer, *Vorlesungen über allgemeine Vererbungs- und Konstitutionslehre*, 2nd edition, 1923, esp. p. 53 seq. The standpoint of strict selectionism is represented in the work of E. Baur, E. Fischer, and F. Lenz, *Grundriss der menschlichen Erblichkeitslehre und Rassenhygiene*, 2nd edition, 1923, 2 vols.

⁸ Cf. Wilsdorf, *Tierzuchtung*, p. 37. Also Professor Keller points out that practical breeders have the same standpoint as Lamarck. Cf. C. Keller, *Stammesgeschichte unserer Haustiere*, 2nd ed., 1919, pp. 24, 32.

⁹ Julius Bauer, pp. 152, 159, 161, 168, 172, 176, 177, 179, 186, 209; Jens Paulsen, "Wesen und Entstehung der Rassenmerkmale," in *AA.*, 1921.

¹⁰ Cf. Waitz, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, 1877, i, 2nd ed., p. 147 seq.; also C. Pearson, *National Life and Character*, 1893; Kohlbrugge in *ARG.*, vii, 1910, p. 564 seq. However, T. W. Gregory in a special chapter of his valuable book (p. 173) gives weighty evidence against the view that the white man cannot become acclimatized in the tropics.

¹¹ Cf. a list of his publications on this problem in *Kbl.*, xxxi, 1900, p. 5; furthermore, his paper "Rassenanatomie der Hand und die Persistenz der Rassenmerkmale," *AA.*, vol. 1902, p. 91. Kollmann, "Beiträge zu einer Kranologie der europäischen Völker," in *AA.*, xii, 1881, p. 82.

¹² Eugen Fischer, *ZMA.*, vol. xviii; "Festschrift für Schwalbe," p. 479, *AA.*, vol. xlv, supplement 2. (*Verhandlungen der Anatomischen Gesellschaft, Innsbruck*, 1914); *Festschrift für E. Hahn*, 1917.

¹³ Cf. Friedrich Ratzel, "Der Ursprung der Arier in geographischem Licht," in *Kleine Schriften*, 1906, vol. ii, p. 392.

¹⁴ Ranke, *Der Mensch*, 2nd ed., vol. ii, 1894, pp. 13, 46, 53, 72, 101, 130. Also L. Bolk, "Ueber die Körperlänge der Niederländer und deren Zunahme in den letzten Dezennen," *ZMA.*, vol. xviii, p. 15; Pfützner, "Sozial-anthropologische Studien," *ZMA.*, vol. iv, 1902, p. 31, especially p. 75. Cf. also many facts quoted by Buschan (*Menschenkunde*, 1909, p. 46) and Finot (*Le préjugé des races*, 1905, pp. 151, 159, 217). Pittard, *Les races et l'histoire*, 1924, p. 17, explains the higher stature of Americans by the greater use of labour-saving agricultural machines. In Europe the rural population,

particularly in the mountains, is smaller because of harder toil, smaller amount of sleep, etc. Stature also influences the form of the skull. Of course, such variations do not affect racial characteristics.

¹⁵ More recent literature quoted by Szombathy, "Ueber relative Schädelmasse," *MWAG*, 1918-19, p. 177, who himself gives there a more refined method.

¹⁶ Such influences are, e.g. deformations by the act of birth, rachitis, hydrocephaly, etc. Vesalius (1543) said that the Germans mostly had flat occiputs and broad skulls because they put babies in the cradle on their backs, while in Belgium the skulls were longer because the children were laid on their sides. Recently Walcher has shown that even twins from one ovulum, who have exactly the same hereditary constitution, adopt quite different skull formations by being placed either on a soft or a hard pillow (*Korrbl.*, 1914, and 1916, p. 68). But this observation must not be over-estimated, cf. Martin, p. 684, Luschan, p. 81.

¹⁷ An increase of round-headedness in historic times has been ascertained in Old Egypt, Crete, Greece, Germany, England, France, Sweden, Holland, the Alpine countries, Bohemia, Moravia, Poland, Bosnia, Russia, Japan, etc.

¹⁸ Cf. Vacher de Lapouge, *Race et milieu social*, 1909, and other books by the same author. However, the tendency of towns towards dolichocephaly seems to exist only in brachycephalic countries; in some dolichocephalic ones an opposite tendency has been found. Therefore, Niceforo tried to explain this simply by the fact that the possessing classes have a greater freedom of changing their domicile: Niceforo, *Anthropologie der nichtbesitzenden Klassen*, 1910.

¹⁹ Johannsen in *ARG.*, iv, p. 171.

²⁰ Cf. Lissauer in *VBG.*, 1901, p. 373. Ivanowsky in *AA.*, 1923, "Anthropometrische Veränderungen russischer Völker unter dem Einfluss der Hungersnot." Also geological conditions influencing the fertility of the soil, nourishment, etc., seem to have an effect. Cf. interesting examples given by Finot, pp. 217-18.

²¹ Regnault, "Variation de l'indice céphalique sous l'influence du milieu," in *BSAB.*, 1901, p. 147 seq. Nyström, "Formenveränderungen des menschlichen Schädels," *AA.*, 1902; cf. also Ranke, pp. 232-3. A. Thomson, "Factors concerned in the production of man's cranial form," *JAI.*, 1903.

²² Since rachitis is mainly a disease of the poorer classes, the deformations of the skull caused by it may lead to the mistaken view that upper and lower classes represent different racial types.

²³ Cf. Baelz and Virchow, *VBG.*, 1901, p. 211 seq.

²⁴ Cf. *Journal of Political Economy*, 1897-8, pp. 77 and 90; 1895-6, p. 262; 1899, p. 248. Measurements give contradictory results.

²⁵ Cf. William Z. Ripley, *The Races of Europe*, 1900 (with extensive bibliography).

²⁶ However, V. Gufrida-Ruggeri, *Homo sapiens*, 1913, quotes Pittard's statement that these Albanians show a marked transformation in the form of their skulls and in their stature.

²⁷ *JAI.*, 1904, p. 206. Also in Kordofan (Africa) the mountain-dwellers are brachycephalic, the plain-dwellers dolichocephalic. Cf. *ZE.*, 1920-1, p. 167.

²⁸ F. Boas, *Changes in Bodily Form of Descendants of Immigrants*, 1912; cf. also Boas, *Kultur und Rasse*, 1914, p. 61 seq. While according to Retzius 30 per cent of all adult Swedes were dolichocephalic and only 13 per cent brachycephalic, Stevenson found that among 100 Swedish children in America there were no long-heads and 61 per cent were broad-heads. Yet Stevenson believes in constancy of the skull. Ranke rather believed the opposite, *AA.*, 1915, p. 141.

²⁹ Cf. Ranke, ii, pp. 239-48.

³⁰ "Beiträge zu einer Kraniologie der europäischen Völker" (*AA.*, xiii, 1881).

³¹ A great number of skeletons were found in a Paris cemetery which were believed to be the remains of Russian soldiers who died in Paris in 1814. A famous anatomist examined the skulls and stated that they belonged to Finns, Bashkirs, Kalmucks, and other Siberian tribes. Unfortunately it was soon

discovered that the skulls belonged exclusively to women who had died in 1832 of cholera. Bean found all European cranial types in the Philippines, *AA.*, 1915, p. 80.

³² Cf. Virchow, "Rassenbildung und Erblichkeit," in *Festschrift für A. Bastian*, 1896, p. 25. The same author in *Kbl.*, 1882, p. 210.

³³ Professor Bruno Bauch in *Kant-Studien*, xxi, 1917, "Vom Begriff der Nation."

³⁴ Cf. also C. Fetzner, "Rassenanatomische Untersuchungen an 17 Hottentottenköpfen," *ZMA.*, 1914

³⁵ Cf. Walter Bagehot, *Ursprung der Nationen*, 1874, p. 44

³⁶ Cf. Dilke, *Greater Britain*, 6th ed., 1872, p. 223. Ripley in *JAI.*, 1908, p. 222. Cf. McDougall, *The Group Mind*, 1921, pp. 214-16.

³⁷ Cf. M. Fishberg, *Die Rassenmerkmale der Juden*, 1913, p. 228, and Bloch in *BSAP.*, 1909.

³⁸ Cf. *ZMA.*, 1903, vi, pp. 28-9.

³⁹ *Mediz. Klinik*, vi, No. 46.

⁴⁰ Waitz, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, 1877, vol. i, pp. 70, 71, 79, 80, 81, 83, 135.

⁴¹ Emerson, *English Traits*, chap. iv. W. Hellpach, "Das frankische Gesicht" (*Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften*, ii, 1921). A comparison between the former physiognomy of the Maoris and the present one is very striking. Cf. Alfred Manes, *Der soziale Erdteil*, 4th ed., 1914, where a few good photographs are given.

⁴² Ratzel, Ranke, and Waitz give a great many instances.

⁴³ However, Fischer and Mollison give only 1,437 ccm. as regards Javanese.

⁴⁴ The skull of the greatest German poet Schiller, as examined by Froriep, had only 1,410 ccm., which corresponds to 1,300 gr. weight. This is even a little less than the average Negro brain weight quoted by Fischer and Mollison. Cf. *AA.*, 1914, p. 79. J. M. Robertson quotes a passage from George Eliot's diary to the effect that she heard the sculptor Rauch say that Schiller had a "miserable forehead" and she herself had observed the same.

⁴⁵ Marchand has weighed 1,169 Hessian brains and found a male average of 1,400 gr. and a female average of 1,275 gr. (cf. *Abhandlungen der sächs. Akademie der Wissenschaften*, xxvii, 1902). According to Handmann, the averages in Saxony were 1,370 gr. and 1,250 gr. respectively (cf. *Archiv für Anatomie und Physiologie*, 1906).

⁴⁶ Cf. on this problem Erich Franke, *Die geistige Entwicklung der Negerkinder*, 1915, p. 116 seq., and Martin, p. 632. The statement that coloured races arrive earlier at sexual maturity has become doubtful. Cf. Franke, p. 104 seq., Balz, in *VBG.*, 1901, p. 211. Eugen Fischer in *Anthropologie*, edited by Schwalbe and Fischer.

⁴⁷ Fischer and Mollison, p. 41. Cf. also R. Thurnwald "Psychologie des primitiven Menschen" (*HVP.*, i), p. 163; Buschan, *Menschenkunde*, pp. 160, 206; Buschan, *Gehirn und Kultur*, 1906.

⁴⁸ Cf. Kohlbrugge in the "Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Science at Amsterdam" (review in the *Jahresberichte für Anatomie*, 1911, iii, 2, p. 868 seq.), also Mall in the same publication, and *Anth.*, v, 1910, p. 280.

⁴⁹ Kohlbrugge in *ARG.*, 1910, vii, p. 564.

⁵⁰ Cf. Kollmann in *ZE.*, 1905, p. 601.

⁵¹ Luschian says it is difficult to define what a coloured race is. A European Governor in Africa once issued an order prescribing what "Negroes, Arabians, Hindoos, Portuguese, Greeks, and other coloured people" should do when meeting a "white man".

⁵² Except probably red hair, in which the pigment appears in another form Fischer has stated recently that the pigment of different races is different (*Erblichkeitslehre*, p. 98).

⁵³ Cf. especially Balz in *VBG.*, 1901, p. 204 seq.

⁵⁴ In *Kbl.*, 1900, p. 49 seq. Cf. A. Basler, *Einführung in die Rassen- und Gesellschaftsphysiologie*, 1925, pp. 39, 48, and T. W. Gregory, *The Menace of Colour*, 1925, p. 184.

⁵⁵ Ranke, pp. 166, 370-1. Westermarck, *Geschichte der menschlichen Ehe* (German ed.), 1897, p. 268. Westermarck quotes a case of a Negro who in Europe became light like a European. Many cases of Europeans who assumed

Negro colour in the tropics are well proved. Cf. Waitz, p. 51 seq., Finot, pp. 235, 244, 452. Some families from the very light Kashmir Brahmans migrated half a dozen generations ago to the South, and have there become quite dark and not to be distinguished from the natives. They are most exclusive as regards marriages, and mixing is out of the question. Cf. W. Crooke, "The stability of caste and tribal groups in India," *JAI*, 1914, p. 270. Myers (*JAI*, 1908) quotes the case of certain Copts who have married only among themselves for 1,300 years and who have become dark. Of course, even the strictest caste laws may not have been able to prevent mixing. It is also possible that climatic selection has taken place.

⁵⁸ Poesche believes that the fairness of the Nordics indicates that they had their origin in a certain region of Russia, where, as he alleges, all organic beings, men, animals, and trees, show a very marked tendency towards albinism. Pribram (*Experimentalzoologie*, vol. iii, 1910) shows that extreme temperature and humidity cause albinism in animals.

⁵⁷ Cf. Ratzel, vol. ii, pp. 681, 695.

⁵⁸ It has been stated innumerable times that Negroes have a peculiar offensive smell, but this seems to be a consequence of their mode of living. Where Negroes live under the same conditions as wealthy whites they do not smell, as is proved by the case that many Negroes are servants, chauffeurs, etc., in the houses of the rich, who would certainly not tolerate an evil smelling person in their home. During the Middle Ages a loathsome smell was ascribed to the Jews, and many Asiatics of to-day find that Europeans stink; this has sometimes been explained by the fact that Europeans eat much more meat and therefore have a different perspiration. A prominent Japanese anthropologist, Dr. Buntaro Adachi, describes the racial smell of the Europeans, which, he says, is distasteful to Japanese. Cf. O. Stoll, *Das Geschlechtsleben in der Volkerpsychologie*, 1908, p. 812. In the eighth century the Pope warned the Frankish kings not to contaminate their blood by marriage with the "stinking Longobardians", the Teutonic rulers of Italy! Schultheiss, *Geschichte des deutschen Nationalgefühls*, 1893, p. 46. Cf. R. Andree, *Volkergeruch, Ethnographische Parallelen N.F. und Globus*, Bd. 61.

⁵⁹ Cf. Dr. K. E. Ranke in *ZE*, 1898, pp. 61-73.

⁶⁰ Waitz adduces many examples, cf. pp. 50-1, 53, 55, 60, 71, 98, 135, 193, 246-7. It seems that dense woods have a bleaching effect. Recently a tribe of white, fair, and blue-eyed Indians has been discovered in a swampy district of Mexico.

⁶¹ Cf. Ratzel, *Volkerkunde*, i, 710; ii, 271. However, there are even near the Equator certain tribes, like the Waganda, Sandeh, etc., that are comparatively light-coloured, without any possible influence of woods.

⁶² Jackmann in *ARG*, 1909, p. 754.

⁶³ Further examples are given by Lyde, "Climatic Control of Skin Colour," in *Papers on Interracial Questions*, 1911, p. 104.

⁶⁴ Cf. *ZMA*, vol. i, 1899, p. 343, and vol. iii, p. 507. Only a quarter of all individuals retain the colour of the hair as it is in the first two years of life, and three-quarters change from fair to dark.

⁶⁵ Cf. Ammon in *ZMA*, vol. ii, p. 279.

⁶⁶ Blue eyes, therefore, are said to indicate pureness of type (as regards this trait), and it is also stated that two blue-eyed parents cannot have brown-eyed children. Yet Joergensen, in the Faroe Islands, found that out of thirty-eight cases where both parents were blue-eyed in fourteen cases the children had brown eyes.

⁶⁷ Flinders Petrie, "The Races of Early Egypt," in *JAI*, 1901, p. 248 (with fine pictures of races); the same author, "Migrations," *JAI*, 1906, p. 189.

CHAPTER III

RACE AND PSYCHOLOGY

ALL race theories are founded on the assertion of inherited mental race characteristics. It is assumed that man's whole mental life is decided by inheritance to a very large extent from the moment of birth, exactly as is the colour of his skin, and that education and environment cannot bring about a considerably higher stage of evolution. Yet with this alone the theory of race is not determined. Certain family characteristics and individual traits are inherited without doubt, though as a rule, this must not be taken in the light of inflexible predestination. Therefore it could also be assumed that within each race the most varied mental abilities, tendencies or tempers are transmitted, without admitting the existence of different mental race characteristics. The assertion that a quite distinctive and momentous mental peculiarity is the heritage of every race is required to establish a race theory in our sense.

These two suppositions must be kept severely apart, for their confusion leads to one of the most widespread fallacies of so-called "scientific" race theorists. Thus the principal and most serious German work of the present day¹ gives a number of more or less proven cases of individual inheritance and by this apparently believes to have demonstrated the existence of a hereditary race character. A further source of error is the want of clarity as to what is to be considered hereditary and how far the tendency persists. Without further examination we presume as more or less proven that certain elementary psychical functions, like perception, feeling, inclination, memory, association and so forth, show in different individuals differences in degree, duration or quickness, and that such individual qualities are transferable to some extent. Racial differences of this kind have, however, not yet been scientifically established.² Neither do we know whether such elementary faculties are inherited in typical combinations (which would mean that more complicated psychical types could be transmitted also) or not. Our experience of physical heredity is telling rather against the transfer of more complicated types.

Moreover, even weak bodily constitutions by systematic training and exercise may be sometimes made capable of remarkable

performances, as anecdotes of famous men tell us, while splendid physical faculties may degenerate root and branch. This must certainly still more be the case with mind; the normal mind being more plastic and more adaptable than matter. Yet many theorists of heredity, particularly in Germany, deny absolutely or almost any chance of moulding innate tendencies. Professor Fritz Lenz, one of the foremost scientific representatives of this school, refers to Peter's assertion that school, environment, home education, have only the slightest influence on school achievements, and believes even that such achievements are conditioned nine-tenths by heredity.³ Elsewhere he says: "It is quite hopeless to imagine that mankind may be raised permanently by training and education."

The view that mental and moral characteristics are fixed and incapable of development is peculiar to all race theorists. All seek to negative or minimize the influence of environment, time, tradition, and education. In other respects, however, views vary. There are some who consider elementary mental dispositions inborn, others that higher ideas are innate, nay even that we come into the world provided with a full and complete philosophy. Not only in popular writings, but even in scientific works, for example in histories, complicated mental images, such as the ideas of God, freedom, duty, truth, private property, family, patriotism, justice, are given as racial predispositions. It seems as if Locke and Kant had never refuted the belief in inborn ideas. But even these uncritical theories of bygone centuries never maintained that inborn ideas differed according to race. Only the materialism of our own day has driven the analogy between mind and body so far as to presuppose a dark skin necessarily corresponds to a dark mind. This exaggeration of the power of heredity is aiming at giving a philosophical basis to mighty political and social tendencies. The doctrines of environment and evolution have a liberal tendency, they teach the fundamental equality of all men whose real difference is represented as the result of a different environment, or of different stages of development. Certainly these doctrines have often been exaggerated too. In strong opposition to them stands the champion of inborn characteristics; inborn ideas are to be the foundation of inborn rights; the noble-born race has a right to rule the inferior one. So Count Gobineau confesses frankly that his race theory was to serve in the fight against Revolution and Liberalism. He says further that his work is the expression of instincts which he brought with him at birth. All race theorists

indeed seek to minimize the part played by reason and to represent the influence of instinct as overwhelming.

INSTINCT AND REASON

MENTAL HEREDITY

By instinctive action is meant useful, but inherited, involuntary reaction. It borders on the one hand on inferior reflexes, on the other on originally conscious action which has become automatic, e.g. mechanical piano playing or walking.⁴ There is now a tendency in psychology, caused by the influence of modern research on heredity, to concede a very large place to mental hereditary disposition.⁵ Such dispositions are little different from instincts, apart from the accompanying idea of purpose, which may perhaps be not quite absent from animal instincts too. Reason plays therein such a restricted rôle that man's entire behaviour appears automatic and instinctive. Human character is already determined through the combination of hereditary tendencies at the time of conception.

This view is founded on real (or presumed) observation, according to which the most varied of mental characteristics are tenaciously preserved among the descendants.⁶ Without doubt certain psychical defects and some reflexes can be explained in this way. Even musical gifts and perhaps also some others seem principally due to heredity. The inheritance of elementary mental tendencies is at least very probable. Yet most of these studies show two grave mistakes. They over-estimate the degree of certainty which is possible on the subject, and draw far-reaching conclusions from quite unimportant chance statistical differences.⁷ Furthermore, they proceed mostly from a belief in the omnipotence of heredity, and take too little account of the effect of the conscious and unconscious influence of education and example. This is true also of the ingenious research work of Francis Galton, the founder of this school of thought. It is certainly not always mental heredity which leads a son to follow the same profession as his famous father, but very often the authority of the father paves the way for him, his example and influence spur him on. So the descendants of prominent politicians, lawyers, professors often go far in the same calling without this being due in any preponderating degree to the inheritance of talent.⁸ The power of family tradition is enormous. It would only be conclusive for the theory of heredity if one could show cases of normal children who have never come under the

influence of their parents or their environment (e.g. orphans brought up in asylums) developing the complicated psychical character of one of the parents.

One ought to be very careful, especially in the application of Mendelian formulæ to psychical facts. When resemblances among relatives appear they are taken as a proof of heredity. When no such resemblances appear or when crass opposites appear, that is put down to the influence of some ancestor which is latent in the parents, or to some other chance play of inheritance. It cannot be taken seriously when R. Sommer in his study, *Goethe im Licht der Vererbungslehre*, 1908, asserts that Goethe inherited his love of nature, especially of botany, from an ancestor, Lindheimer by name, who was born 200 years before Goethe and whose gifts are supposed to have appeared again fifty years after Goethe in a botanist of the same name.

German writers have also taken great pains to explain Bismarck's genius by tracing it back to his ancestors. Yet this has failed entirely. Bismarck's father and his ancestors were all average Junkers without any prominent gifts, and though among the ancestors and more distant relatives of his mother there were several professors and bureaucrats of some importance, their mental type was entirely different from that of the great German statesman.⁹

This unrestricted explanation of all mental phenomena as inherited unchangeable instincts denies the whole development of the human race, and indeed is in direct opposition even to animal psychology. Neither are the instincts of animals unalterable, nor are they the only motive power. Bees, ants, and birds sometimes suit their inherited habits to their environment in a very remarkable degree. True, the bird inherits its song, e.g. young doves brought up in complete isolation developed their normal tonation¹⁰: but sparrows which were kept with canaries developed the canary song, and when they were put later among sparrows they adapted themselves to their sparrow environment and changed again when put back in the first milieu. Canaries learn from nightingales their song and lose their own entirely.¹¹ But above all, the taming of domestic animals proves a fundamental change of instinct. Ferocious beasts have developed into the tamed specimens which a child herds in the meadow. The wolf becomes a good-natured dog. It is doubtful if this is purely a question of selection. In farmyards cat, dog, and fowl, contrary to all their instincts, live peaceably together, and surely this has little to do with selection. The higher animals without doubt show signs of reason, be they ever

so limited. Also wild animals are taught a good deal by their parents and in some cases even by other members of the herd, acting as teacher.

Man seems to be particularly poor in instincts and just this deficiency seems to have forced him to the development of his intelligence. The new-born child brings very little with it, even the ideas of time and space come only gradually to the infant.¹² And nowhere afterwards does one meet with a spontaneous appearance of inherited tendencies ready made. If the mental life depends on instinct why is man not born with the power to use his mother tongue as animals develop their characteristic voices? In reality many advocates of heredity take for granted that the brain has special race abilities for its own language, into the delicacy of which no foreigner can penetrate. That is certainly untrue. Black children acquire English, German or French just as well, perhaps even quicker than Europeans do.

INHERITED TENDENCIES OR ENVIRONMENT

The controversy as to whether inherited tendencies or environment are stronger expresses itself in the sphere of natural science in the great antagonism between the followers of the teachings of Lamarck and Weismann. Likewise in pathology, medicine, and hygiene there are conflicting opinions as to whether diseases are more due to the inner constitution of the body or to outward causes. With regard to mental life we find the same antithesis in character-ology; sexual, juvenile, and criminal psychology; pedagogy; criminal law; psychopathology; in the philosophy of history and social science.

It is remarkable that one of the most important researchers in mental inheritance, Professor W. Peters, who is often cited as the chief authority against the theory of environment, discusses mental heredity in a rather reserved and cautious way in his latest work, and accentuates strikingly the importance of environment.¹³

Certainly also the forces of environment and of education must not be over-emphasized. Surroundings and up-bringing are of little regard when neither disposition nor susceptibility is present. The main error of certain heredity fanatics is that they view predisposition in a too restricted sense. This even as regards physical life is untenable to-day. The botanist A. v. Tschermack declared: "Almost every cell, at least among many animals and plants, is capable of much more than it normally shows. In every single organism there slumber usually a host of other evolutionary,

or at least functional possibilities." Therefore Huetpe, though rather a believer in race, considers possible even the inheritance of acquired characteristics in the sense that latent qualities may become manifest. However, we may assume that the soul of man is still much richer in possibilities of development than are physical organisms.

One of the gravest self-deceptions of the race theorists consists in the view that complicated social and historical traits are held to be race tendencies. He who does not see that such things as sense of truth, or duty, tolerance, political consciousness or commercial capacity are products of a long historical development and not innate tendencies, must be ignorant of history.

If race tendencies were stronger than history how can the character and cultural differences and political antagonisms among people who, racially, are almost one, e.g. Swedes and Norwegians,¹⁴ Swiss and Tyrolese, Czechs and Slovaks, Servians and Croatsians be explained? Why have the English and the Northern Germans, both being to a large extent of almost the same racial stock, developed widely divergent philosophies of politics and ethics? Why did the Flemish Belgians break away from the Netherlands in the revolution of 1830, and why could the Norwegians not live together with the Swedes in the same state? Certainly race differences hardly counted in all these cases, yet differences in character and fundamental views played a great part.

It is possible to prove in different fields that, apart from pathological cases, environment is stronger than natural tendencies. Even sexual character, surely a fundamental fact of nature, is no exception. It is generally taken for granted that man and woman represent psychologically quite different beings, that in woman in particular gifts of genius or even every predisposition towards higher mental activity are wanting. Impartial inquiry, however, shows that this is prejudice to justify masculine superiority, as race theories are destined to justify scientifically the oppression of certain peoples or classes. Though there are, of course, certain differences, yet it can be proved irrefutably that much that is considered specially feminine is the result of social and historical conditions, in other words of environment. Under other conditions the picture changes completely and so-called feminine qualities appear as masculine and vice versa.¹⁵

Criminal statistics essentially give the same result. In former times colonies were often populated by criminals and all manner of rabble, a great part of Australia and Brazil, for example. The

RACE AND PSYCHOLOGY

Transportation of convicts to New South Wales lasted till 1848, Tasmania till 1853, to Western Australia till 1868, and in all 10,000 persons were deported. Then came a stream of gold diggers who also were a somewhat rough lot. And yet the Australians show no great signs of the after effects of these less worthy elements. Haycraft asserts that this is due to the fact that the criminals drank themselves to death.¹⁶ We may perhaps rather assume that the wasters were improved by hard work in the new world. Mark Twain says somewhere that in good Australian society it is considered in bad taste to inquire who one's grandfather was. Of the lower people in Brazil an authority says they are the happiest lot of people on earth, and he depicts them in a very friendly light.¹⁷

CASTE ; NOBILITY

If, further, personal value were to depend on face, breeding experience with castes, nobility, and hereditary professions would show more favourable results.¹⁸ In reality the severe exclusiveness of such groups has always led to mental sterility and ossification. The higher nobility has usually tried to form a sort of caste and mostly only married within its own circle. However, many noble families in the Middle Ages sprang from bond servants who by serving their kings or princes in war and peace gradually rose to high rank. Later also race purity could never be strictly preserved. Inclination and material reasons often broke through the principle of equality of birth. Moreover, the nobility felt itself to be an international caste, considering marriage with the middle class of its own country as *mésalliance* but not that with the nobility of other peoples. It should be called to mind that the most illustrious nobility of the world and that culturally most meritorious, the English nobility, which to-day in spite of all democratization supplies distinguished leaders to the Conservative as well as to the Liberal party, has never recognized the strict legal principle of equal birth, and English kings have even married middle class wives. The English nobility has always absorbed members of the middle class who rose by their talents or by luck, and the descendants of these even form the majority of the present English aristocracy. On the other hand the younger sons of the nobility entered the middle class, as apart from a few exceptions only the eldest inherited title and fortune. Thus the English nobility has been a living limb of the whole people and therefore could hold a position powerful and culturally important, while the Continental nobility which,

according to the principle of birth cultivated "race" and according to the race theorists is the purest specimen of Teutonic blood, forms for the most part a striking contrast of political blindness, unprogressiveness, and cultural sterility, especially in Germany, where pride of caste and birth were carried to absurd extremes.¹⁹

GENIUS, HEREDITY, AND ENVIRONMENT

The apostles of the hereditary theory lay special value on the facts which show genius as a product of heredity. But as against this there is overwhelming evidence that real genius is very rarely inherited. Even the ancients noticed this.²⁰ The heredity theory pettifoggers explain uncomfortable cases by declaring that genius is not a single tendency, but arises out of a happy combination of a number of qualities in which the inheritance factors even of distant progenitors play a part. If then a genius has intellectually average or less than average children this is put down to the chance combination of unfavourable hereditary qualities, and in the contrary case it is a triumphant proof of heredity. Such a method on the face of it is self-deception.

Naturally one can accept as having very great probability that in the formation of genius and talent the hereditary factor plays a part. Only exaggerated statements are wrong, e.g. that heredity is everything, environment nothing, or that even complicated mental characters can be inherited. The falsity of the first supposition is proved particularly by the fact, hitherto little noticed, that *men of genius appear mostly in groups*. Every people has its century of genius, the glory of which is its greatest pride. With the Greeks it was the fifth century (and its aftermaths), then came the time of Christ and Augustus, the Crusades, the Renaissance, the great century of "enlightenment". All these were cosmopolitan epochs in which different centres of culture came into fruitful contact, in which belief in spiritual progress, freedom, humanity, awakened enthusiasm, in which the example of the high cultural development of certain nations spurred the energies of the other just awakening peoples to noble rivalry. Very often also great interminglings between the people took place. This phenomenon of "great centuries" shows that genius cannot be separated from environment. Is it conceivable, for example, that the astounding number of great thinkers, poets, artists, and statesmen that appeared in the eighteenth century in all civilized lands was due to a happy combination of heredity factors? ²¹ A biological explanation of this intellectual phenomenon seems about as scientific as an

astrological one by the constellation of the stars. Certainly the circumstances of the times, though they may not have created genius, must have made it easier for men of great gifts to mature, to become famous, to accomplish their highest. I have compiled a list of almost 200 leading men of genius in the eighteenth century which could easily be doubled if one added names which belong in reality to the period although their lives do not fall within the century, or if one added other great though less known names.

THE CONCEPTIONS OF RACE CHARACTER

All the foregoing conclusions show that environment is a more important factor than the race theorists allow. Their second fundamental thesis must now be examined, namely the belief in uniform hereditary race character. There are different conceptions of race character, which, however, are often not kept strictly asunder. Firstly, opinions are at variance as to whether race character consists in

- (a) higher ideas, like God, duty, honour, etc. ;
- (b) elementary or complex psychical forces, e.g. sensation, imagination, feeling, aspiration, attention, memory, fancy, reflexion ;
- (c) instincts and impulses, e.g. sexual impulse, acquisitive desire, artistic instinct, fighting instinct, etc. ;
- (d) temperament—a highly controversial and indistinct notion but which somehow serves to express the dynamics of the mind, the peculiarity of its functioning in contrast with the more static conception.

In addition, race theories differ in still another way. They either assume a qualitative or a purely quantitative or a distributive difference in race tendencies.

Qualitative difference may be defined as the conception that in one race every individual has tendency (a), in another every individual tendency (b). Quantitative difference expresses the view that the same tendencies appear here and there but in different degrees of intensity, one individual of the one race showing two (a), one of the other race only (a). Distributive difference can be defined as the view that the difference lies in the varying frequency of the appearance of special types, that e.g. in one race 80 per cent of the individuals are types (a), in another race only 5 per cent.

Finally the tendencies may either be supposed to be practically unchangeable, or such as may develop in time according to prevailing conditions.

From this arise many combinations which however, do not all play a rôle, and further numerous transitions.

• QUALITATIVE RACE DIFFERENCES

Differences in certain elementary qualities or tendencies would be conceivable if it could be accepted that races are the pure offspring from pairs of equally gifted ancestors. History shows, however, that such is never the case. Every historical race seems already to have absorbed other elements, which cannot have been all of a superior or inferior mental type. Within each race of any importance are found all degrees of capacities, although the highest can only develop under exceptional circumstances. Mere shades of mental endowment can scarcely be described as race characteristics, any more than slight variations of a definite hair colour.

The view would seem more probable that originally almost identical races were developed in different directions by different conditions of life, for example, by means of natural and social selection. Certainly life in a desert or primeval forest requires other talents than the modern industrial environment demands. Yet, if such was the case, there must also be a great variability of mental types, enabling races to adapt themselves quickly to new conditions. This is proved by history in the case of many races and, of course, we can only speak here of historical races, on which we have sufficient observations for closer study and comparison.

According to the simplest and most widespread view the black, white, and yellow races are mentally as different as the colour of their skins; a rather materialistic theory though its believers used to assert that they were idealists. In one race faithfulness, profound feeling, idealism, etc., are inborn, in another hypocrisy, superficiality, materialism, and so on. The holders of this view dare very often to state apodictically the race of a historical person or the racial origin of a special trait in his character, because they suppose that certain mental characteristics are typical for distinct races. It has been pretended, for example, that Jesus can have been no Jew as his spirit did not agree with the preconceived idea of Judaism. A certain knightly hero or a pioneer in a cultural sphere must have Nordic blood in him even if he was born black or yellow. Naturally under such suppositions a change in race character either by race selection or by adaptation seems difficult, because it would presuppose a certain variability of types.

Such an ideology is blind to the simple fact that in every people and in every race many types are found and that nobody can say which is the true racial one. Is Goethe the typical German or Ludendorff, Herder or Hitler? Is English character reflected in Northcliffe²² or in the Quakers?; the French in Jaurès or Montaigne, or among the raging chauvinists? And such contradictions lie within each racial or national unit, even within each individual. We are inclined, for example, to reproach certain peoples, e.g. the Chinese and Turks, with cruelty, and it is quite easy to quote many instances in proof of it, but every careful study shows just as many opposite characteristics. The Turks generally dislike hunting, which they regard as cruelty to animals; they love to set birds free (which are offered for sale everywhere for that purpose); they generally were much kinder to their slaves than white planters. The Chinese have a repugnance to blood, wherefore even operations are abhorred; they are peace-loving in the extreme; their love of family appears to us as absurdly exaggerated; and they are very fond of animals. One sees Chinese carrying round their singing birds in cages as we take children for a walk. Thus one may collect reports concerning the character of a people made by quite reliable observers and find they are poles apart. The only possible conclusion therefore is that certain traits are not deep-rooted race characteristics but mere habits, which under given circumstances arise and disappear and which may easily contradict each other.

Further, a wider look into history teaches that people change their mental habits in a short time without any question of a change of race. Often enough Cæsar and Tacitus have been cited to prove the constancy of the race characteristics of the Gauls and German peoples, but J. M. Robertson and W. D. Babington have shown that this conclusion is without foundation.²³ The old Germanic peoples in their bear skins, who considered work the greatest disgrace, would have laughed not a little at the suggestion of considering modern German or English business activity as a race virtue. The modern Germans represent a complete conversion from extreme individualism to the strictest of State worship, from cosmopolitanism to nationalism, from a people of poets and thinkers to machine-like factory workers and soldiers. R. Michels says that Genovesi in 1820 wrote that the Germans would never be able to develop a trade and commerce or produce a population like the French and English, and a German writer when he first heard of railways being built was of the opinion that such things

were of no good in Germany, because the German character was too easy going. The Slavs, whom one has often accused of lacking statesmanlike qualities, have proved the contrary.²⁴ In the Bible the Jews appear at certain stages as a warlike and peasant folk with no inclination for commerce. Their descendants differ widely from the old Maccabees and oil planters; but many Jews are turning back consciously to the old ideals; indeed, when occasion offers they fall into vices diametrically opposed to the previous ones.

The Anglo-Saxons came as bold sea-farers to England, but in a short time they seem to have lost all inclination to the sea, and recovered it only at a much later period. Treitschke points out that the inhabitants of the south-east of England were for centuries progressive, while the raw north-west was reactionary,²⁵ but as soon as the age of iron and coal began and the north-west was industrialized the rôles were reversed. The sterility of modern England as regards music is one of the most remarkable phenomena; a gifted publicist called his book about England *The Land Without Music*. Moreover, musical talent is almost always considered a product of heredity, owing nothing to the force of environment. But old England was very musical; it has been discovered lately that music flourished there much earlier than on the Continent. Puritan zealotism fairly killed it.²⁶ David Hume says that a century ago the English burned with religious fervour, while now of all peoples on the earth they show the coolest indifference.²⁷ When Hume wrote these lines John Wesley had already begun his religious revival which within a short space of time produced a flaming devotion. Hume thought, too, that of all peoples the English had the least national character, for the constitution gave to each class, party, and sect the most absolute freedom of development.

Professor Paul Seippel has shown in his valuable work on France²⁸ that different mental types appear in her history which indeed show also certain resemblances through a common national tradition. Finally reference should be made to Billeter's learned work on the *Essence of Hellenism*,²⁹ in which countless opinions of the greatest Greek scholars on the true Greek character are quoted. They are hopelessly at variance with one another, because the Greeks also displayed the most diverse individualities (as Theophrastus long ago remarked).

All races of the world in the same circumstances and at the same stage of development show often most surprising similarities, as ethnology, sociology, and history have convincingly proved.

DISTRIBUTIVE RACE CHARACTER

In most scientific writings we frequently find a conception of race character which may be called distributive.³⁰ It admits that in all races about the same tendencies are partly developed and partly latent, but in varying proportions, so that in one race type (*a*) is predominant, in another type (*b*) is specially frequent. According to this theory there also exist minority types which by means of historical selection become the ruling type, thus opening up the possibility of a complete change of race character. It is often assumed that in the course of history, through wars, feuds, and revolutions, the warlike aristocracy is completely wiped out from among a people so that only the peace-loving residuum remains. Therefore it also becomes impossible to state the racial origins of individual types, for every type appears in different races.

This view is a concession to the multiplicity and changeableness of type. It is, however, in contradiction to the biological race conception, and this has curiously enough not yet been noticed. No anthropologist could begin his definition of a race thus: the colour of the skin varies from white to black, the shape of the skull from extreme longheadedness to extreme broadness and so on. Variations within a race cannot be so widely divergent, else it is not a race but a mixture of races. But we find within the same physical types the greatest diversity of mental traits. Among the fair-haired, blue-eyed, long skulled race there are soft dreamy temperaments and hard, keen, money and power hunters,³¹ exactly as among other races. The acceptance of a distributive race character therefore denies the notion of race as laid down by natural science.

THE TEMPERAMENT DOCTRINE

The theory of temperament as a race characteristic is very old and widespread. It differs from other conceptions in that it does not consider complex ideas and formed character as inborn, but as a certain rhythm of the soul rooted in conditions of the body, which by culture may allow manifold intellectual developments. The sanguine temperament, for example, is compatible with love of peace or of war, with high or low ideals, with a sense for art or the opposite. In the term "sanguine temperament" there is nothing which excludes any of these characteristics. Many brilliant writers, especially in France, have tried to explain the whole disposition and ideology of a people through temperament, in which connexion the most daring speculations have been made.³²

The same objections may be brought against such exaggerations which have already been discussed. Moreover, the temperament doctrine is often found in such close connexion with the environment theory that it is impossible to establish exactly whether the author ascribes more influence to the one factor or the other, or whether he considers temperament as really racial (i.e. inherited) or as a product of climate.

The theory of temperament is very old. The Chinese believe that a male and a female principle compose the universe, with which certain notions of temperament are connected. They believe that the female is cold and moist and the male warm and dry, a theory also found in Heraclitus and Hippocrates.³³ In modern times characteristical speculations assert a mixture of certain characteristics of both sexes in every individual, and this finds a certain proof in the theory of heredity and embryology.³⁴ Often enough they also speak of male and female, active and passive races. Bismarck once said: "The Germans, the Teutonic race, are the male principle, which strides through Europe fructifying. The Celts and Slavs are the female part."³⁵

Hippocrates may be regarded as the founder of the temperament theory and his teaching was continued chiefly by Galen. According to these there are four temperaments, the sanguine, the choleric, the phlegmatic, and the melancholic, and these they brought into connexion with the four saps or humours of the body, as with the four elements, the four astrological quarters of the world, and the four origins of sickness. According to Plato there are three parts in the soul complex which localize in the brain, heart, and liver, and he explains inner conflicts and character divergencies as their disagreements.³⁶ Aristotle taught that climate decides the temperature and thickness of the blood, the inner warmth, and with it the mental abilities.³⁷ He considered all northern races on account of their excessive inner heat unfitted for higher mental activity and political organization. Galen agrees with him.

The doctrine of four temperaments has found followers even in quite recent times, e.g. Immanuel Kant.³⁸ He bases his division on the combination of the tempers. This philosopher is also inclined to accept inborn racial tendencies of peoples, yet he insists that the acquired character may overcome inherited temperament. Linnæus divides mankind into four main races, the choleric American, the sanguine European, the melancholic Asiatic, and the phlegmatic African. W. Wundt likewise accepts four temperaments. Temperament is brought into connexion

with the strength and velocity of nerve vibrations. The choleric is strong and quick, the phlegmatic weak and slow. Jodl conceives temperament as velocity of active reaction, but remarks that temperament is rather a popular than a scientific mode expression.³⁹ Other views are put forward by Herbart, Bahnsen, Ebbinghaus, Neumann, Elsenhans, Lipmann, Kerschensteiner, Ewald. Finally we mention the research work of certain French scholars, namely Perez, Ribot, Paulhan, Fouillée, Malapert,⁴⁰ who try to build their classifications of temperament on quite new bases.⁴¹

What temperament really is in spite of all efforts still remains rather indefinite, and every attempt to turn definitions to practical use leads to contradiction as, for example, when Ribot pictures sensitive people as brooding pessimists and Fouillée calls them superficial optimists. As a result the whole doctrine of temperament has in recent times been considered out of date and unscientific. But here again a change is coming in line with the development of modern medicine. The inborn character is considered more and more as an important factor in the origin of certain illnesses, and at the same time the old humoral doctrine of Hippocrates is reviving to some extent in a quite new form in so far as great weight is laid on the hormones, or inner secretions, of the human constitution.⁴² Different classifications of the constitution were proposed as, for example, a respiratory, a digestive, a muscular, and a cerebral type. Interesting studies on the human frame, temperament, and character were made by E. Kretschmer.⁴³ He starts from psychiatry and believes that the two forms of normal temperaments, the *zyklothymics* and the *schizothymics*, correspond to the two main groups of mental diseases which are again subdivided and appear in numerous combinations. Types of temperament seem primarily to be the result of the humours and they express themselves in the physical build and physiognomy. The *zyklothymics* mostly have moderate sized pycnic stature, broad faces, are corpulent, friendly, capable of enjoyment, energetic, practical folk, realists, empiricists, humorists, etc. On the contrary, the *schizothymics* belong to the slender, asthenic or muscular type, often produce peculiar profiles, thin, long noses and receding chins. Their mental make-up is that of the idealist dreamer, the romanticist, the formal artist, expressionist, ironist, egoist, and eccentric, they include heroic ascetics, political fanatics, despots, and cold calculating minds. The appearance of many men of genius seems to confirm these views. Kretschmer's work is full of interest but needs much closer

examination. However, he does not apply his types to race differences, but other authors have compared the "pycnic" type to the Alpine race, the schizothymics to the northern race.

It appears indeed that among all peoples there are great diversities of temperament, though probably in very varied ratios.⁴⁴ Certainly there are people like the Dutch, Swiss, Swedish, German, and English who give one the impression of being preponderatingly phlegmatic, while the Italian, French, and Jewish are often distinguished by an exuberant temperament.⁴⁵ Temperament in the sense of mental speed can doubtless produce violent antipathies, which can contribute to race hatred. Slow, clumsy and agile, nervous people get on each other's nerves. Unfortunately we do not know how far it is here a question of race tendencies or only of deep-rooted national traditions, the product of education. Among the phlegmatic English and Germans sometimes a neurasthenic nationalism and exalted religious devotion can be observed, while as shown in their own satiric literature the heavy humdrum type appears among the nervous French and Italians. Danes and Norwegians speak almost the same language and racially are closely related, but the Norwegian temperament is described as heavy, broody, "primitive Teutonic," while the Danes are said to be of a liveliness resembling the French. A similar contrast is observed between closely related Slav nations, e.g. Czechs and Poles, Servians and Croatians. The causes are obviously to be traced in historical, economic, and social development. It has often been asserted that in every nation the southerners are more lively than the northerners. Changes of temperament, too, are perceptible in the course of time. The fidgety Jew learns quickly, as soon as he has made his fortune and entered good society, how to imitate the nonchalant behaviour and affected lack of temperament of the aristocracy. In short, here also environment seems to play a large part, though we should not go so far as to deny innate temperament as a factor altogether.

EVOLUTION AND TRADITION

The evolutionary conception consists in the supposition that there are inherited diversities of racial talents, but that these represent only graded steps in a chain of development. According to this view, races would not be equal but capable in the course of development of becoming equal. Here again it is a question not of absolute but of approximate and possible equality, which is

the psychological foundation of actual and modern social co-operation. History seems to prove that the mental outfit of the human race is under certain conditions extraordinarily quick in adapting itself, though it is doubtful whether habits so acquired are transmitted by heredity. On the other hand, there is also a very powerful tendency in man to stick to traditional habits of life. This is the case with national traditions too and is very often taken as a proof of racial inheritance.

Jacobins and Bolsheviks would root out every trace of the hated monarchical tradition, yet in their political systems the features of their national absolutism and imperialism reappeared. So stubbornly does man cling to his habits that he retains them even when he has lost every remembrance of their former meaning. Our mental life is full of inheritance from ancient days not yet explained. Why is marriage among brothers and sisters forbidden? How did the kiss arise? It could not have been instinct, as many historical and ethnological examples show. Tradition stretches over enormous epochs. Two thousand years B.C. an unknown race descended into the Italian plains from the Alps and brought their acquired habits down from the Alpine lakes or from Hungary with them. Their habit of living in pile dwellings they continued to cling to when they were no longer settled on the water, even when they lived on hill tops (Terramare civilization⁴⁶). This civilization was the mother of that of Rome, the Pontifex took his name from the bridge which led to all the pile dwellings, and even to this day the Roman Pope bears this ancient title which lost its original meaning thousands of years ago. The Stone Age peoples of Europe strewed red earth on their dead to give them blood, life, and strength in the other world, as also other races in different continents were doing. Likewise a triumphant Roman general had to paint himself with red lead like a Sioux chief, and apparently this is the origin of the custom which makes the lords of the earth, the emperors, kings, cardinals, and generals wear purple.⁴⁷

The members of the higher classes shudder at the sight of horse flesh when they recognize it, without knowing that this goes back to the time when the Church forbade the Germanic peoples the use of horse flesh for their heathen sacrifices. Similar reasons explain the Jewish prohibition of pork. Very primitive ideas lie at the bottom of circumcision, communion, etc. Is it not remarkable that the Jews who were driven from Spain and Western Germany to the East of Europe in the Middle Ages still cling to their Spanish

or German speech in its old form? Thousands of similar examples might be cited as proof of the power of tradition.

Tradition would lead to complete fossilization if humanity were not compelled to develop new habits through great geological and climatic changes, through the growth of population and insufficiency of the means of subsistence, through invasions by other peoples or contact with foreign ideas: but tradition also may lead to a change of habits, as often people are bound by the unintentional results of their actions, e.g. kings had sometimes to compel their resisting subjects to appear in Parliament to sanction taxes, whereafter these subjects came gradually to the modern idea of political freedom and developed that very parliamentarism which robbed the king of power. Wundt calls this the law of Heterogony of Aims,⁴⁸ and he sees in it a great motive force of moral development. Want of tradition may at certain stages advance civilization, and we understand Goethe's verses on America having it better than our old Continent as it lacked the burdens of history and useless inherited strife. Yet higher progress is only accomplished by its linking up with mental tradition, which indeed is not to be mistaken for the stupid conservatism of outlived forms.

All theories of race commit the unpardonable error of mixing up tradition and instinct. Until the eighteenth century French culture was rightly held by the Germans as a model, being far superior to their own. This advance dated very far back. Even prehistoric research shows us that the territory of present-day France was culturally far in advance in the oldest observed periods of human civilization.⁴⁹ Apparently the early blossoming of France was due to the fact that in the Ice Age a great part remained uncovered by the ice masses such as long retarded every development in the Alpine lands, Germany, and North Europe. Of course, the favourable conditions for traffic, the climate, the fruitfulness and the history of France and before all the Roman, Italian, and Arabian cultural influence also played a great part. Now narrow-minded French writers, filled with national conceit, have brought forward this later development of the Germans and North Europeans as proof of race inferiority, just as Aristotle denied the northern peoples all possibility of higher civilization on account of the climatic psychological conditions. In 1671 the Jesuit Dominique Bouhours denied that a German could have spirit because the rough temperament and massive build of the northerners prevented it. The Academician J. Barbier d'Aucour, J. F. Cramer, and C. Thomasius protested in several books against this affront to the Germans.⁵⁰

At the beginning of the eighteenth century the famous Professor Walch in Jena passed a very derogatory judgment on the Swedes in his philosophical lexicon, putting forward that the thick air of Sweden prevented every mental development. J. Friédrich Kruger wrote a book against him refuting severely this race theory. Kruger remarked that the Swedes, especially in Germany and France, were considered as quite barbaric and even as "beasts without reason". Naturally it was not difficult to show up these foolish allegations in their true light.⁵¹ The gigantic step forward of German culture in the time of Goethe made the old French lead vanish rapidly, and in many respects placed Germany in the first place. Sweden also has for long been in the front row of civilized nations; one can even say that in many points it outdistances the great militaristic states.

IS RACE ANTIPATHY A NATURAL LAW?

Along with the idea of race character that of an inborn race feeling plays a part. It is said that blood relationship is instinctively recognized while race strangers show an instinctive abhorrence to each other. Race hatred is thus pronounced "scientifically" as a law of nature. Indeed the more untenable race theories are shown to be in the light of scientific criticism the more race theories love to make use of the "Voice of Blood" which enables them without more ado to feel that all great men of genius were surely Nordic, even when we know absolutely nothing about their appearance or their forefathers. In the same way they smell out the foreign enemy. Therefore all race theorists and especially Houston Stewart Chamberlain speak scathingly of reason and science and hold up instinct as infallible.

Even if a race instinct could be proved scientifically this would be no judgment in favour of race hatred, for in the end all progress rests on the taming and restraint of natural instincts. Apparently cannibals would try to justify their inclinations as instinct. But it is clear that the acceptance of an inborn race feeling or a repulsion is untenable. Such an instinct would first of all make parents and children, or brothers and sisters recognize each other by the voice of blood, which is in no wise the case. History offers innumerable examples of the fact that closely related peoples were the bitterest foes, Germans and Danes, Germans and English, Germans and French, Poles and Russians, Serbs and Croats. On the other hand we see that simple people who have not been artificially infected by national and racial ideas have no such

antipathies even when the physical differences are very great. Although the Huns are represented as very ugly devils we find among the old Germans few traces of a race antipathy towards them. The daughters of German princes married Hunnish chiefs—the *Nibelungs* song, which represents the views of mediaeval chivalrous society, tells of King Attila's marriage to Kriemhild and pictures the king of the Huns as a noble knightly prince, "one of the most worthy kings that ever lived," although it accents the difference between heathen and Christian. In *Waltharius* he is described in like manner.⁵² We have many proofs that in the Middle Ages there was scarcely any real race antipathy between Nordics and Arabs.⁵³ Brotherhoods were often established between Christian and Arab knights, there were marriages even between the princely houses, and the thought found utterance that all men were brothers.⁵⁴ We more often find an expression of strong antipathy between German and Italian, German and Slav, which, however, was founded in political conflicts.⁵⁵ In the Orient there is still to-day no race feeling against free coloured peoples, but there are sharp cultural, religious, and traditional enmities between peoples who are racially near relations, between peasants and nomads, which often resemble fanatical race hatred.⁵⁶ As to modern America, W. Ripley affirms that there is no physical antipathy between the different peoples.⁵⁷ Opposition to mixed marriages between groups of people rests, according to Ripley, chiefly on social differences. His observations, however, chiefly concern emigrants from Europe.

It is further noticeable that among many peoples certain occupations are held in general contempt, though we are not able to recognize the reason. Among primitive peoples smiths and weavers are often considered inferior, and in mediaeval Germany millers, surgeons, tanners and linen-weavers were despised. Our nobility considered even the mentally most prominent non-nobles of their own nation as of unequal birth or of inferior blood and often could not conclude a true marriage with them. Such social traditions easily lead to an instinctive antipathy quite resembling race contempt. Indians and Polynesians are recognized by modern Europeans as of equal birth. Many race-proud Americans consider an admixture of Red Indian blood as not degrading and even aristocratic, but a mixture of Negro blood is abhorrent. Apparently this is to be explained by the fact that the Negroes were slaves, but the Red Indians and Polynesians were not. The great sociologist, Max Weber, proves convincingly⁵⁸ that race feeling very often springs from historical class separation, or from the purely

imaginary belief of being related or not and from a desire to be something better than socially inferior classes. He says rightly that everywhere often just radical nationalists are of foreign descent. Renegades and converts persecute their former brothers in faith and blood in the most violent manner. Very often social, economic, religious, and racial differences create an instinctive antipathy which is then interpreted as a purely racial one.

Equality of rank, property, beauty, charm, and spirit have often proved themselves stronger than racial instincts. We could mention many cases where European scholars or aristocrats have married Japanese women. Innumerable aristocrats have married Jewesses. A Hamburg merchant and patrician Rüete married a daughter of the Sultan of Zanzibar, who by her great mental gifts was appreciated very much at the Imperial Court of Germany: she was a friend of the Empress Frederic and has written her life.⁵⁹ Peter the Great had a Negro Hannibal whose high degree of intelligence brought him to be artillery engineer general and a great estate owner and who married a noble Russian lady. His grandson was the greatest of Russian poets Pushkin.⁶⁰ Another Negro, Soliman, in the eighteenth century was prominent at the Viennese Court, and he as well as his daughter married aristocrats.⁶¹ These cases are worthy of note and show how greatly race arrogance has grown in a hundred years, for to-day such things would be scarcely possible. Some years ago at an anthropological congress a professor from Germany demanded the public whipping of white women who either in legal or free marriage lived with Negroes, a proof that there is at least one inferior race in the world, namely, certain race doctrinaires.

RACE HATRED AND WORLD HISTORY

A certain aversion to all that is foreign appears to exist in human and even in animal nature. Animals which are put into a new herd or a common cage are often brutally treated by their own kind and on occasion even killed.⁶² But this feeling soon disappears, and not seldom quite remarkable friendships and signs of a sympathetic feeling can be observed among animals which are enemies by instinct, e.g. among dogs and cats or cats and birds.⁶³

Many sociologists take it for granted that race hatred in the mere sense of aggressiveness and rapacity towards everything foreign irrespective of whether the foreigner is of the same race or not is the driving motive of world history. Ludwig Gumplowicz⁶⁴ is one of the chief representatives of this theory. The greater part

of his work is an attempt to refute the monogenistic and to affirm the polygenistic theory. Present races have developed from a great number of small tribes of varied descent, the amalgamation of which is the historical process. Hostile races may in a short time be moulded into one new race and oppose others in the same fierce opposition, until in turn it succumbs to a conquering people and comes into the melting pot of amalgamation. Nature's wisdom has carefully laid this feeling of hatred in the breast of humanity. The most important difference between man and animal is that only the former has the capacity to rule and plunder his kind.⁶⁵ This plundering, be it the preying on, enslavement or imposition of tributes, etc., has always been the aim of human endeavour, and is also to-day at the bottom of every war. The decisive point is, however, that this plundering impulse is always directed against the foreigner, that it is felt as race hatred. It always leads to the subjugation of weaker tribes and states. As soon as the victor has gained his end he seeks to stabilize his domination by the ideologies of state, nationality, right, religion, etc., which are all means to the end of securing the domination in the interests of the lords, though some advantages at least also accrue to the conquered from the preservation of order. Class and social standing, too, go back to original race differences which have mostly been covered by the cunning victor with the veil of common nationality, often by adopting the language of the vanquished. Gumpłowicz is, however, far removed from the hypocrisy of those who see in oppression a benefit for the oppressed. Moral judgment does not come into his range of vision, all human races appear to him equally brutal, greedy, jealous of power and filled with race hatred. But this hate is the tool of nature in the great melting process of the races which is history. However, we cannot recognize any aim in this process. Considerable cultural progress is not allotted to humanity, the eternal circle of enslaving and being enslaved is its fate. The pessimistic wisdom of the preacher, "All is vanity," appears to Gumpłowicz to be the highest within men's reach, the principal gain of sociology.

There is certainly a grain of truth in these theories which have been put forward with so much boldness and merciless openness. But Gumpłowicz exaggerates race hatred; he holds that the impulse to subdue is inborn in man, while it is mostly outward circumstances which drive men to the sword. Among primitive peoples, so long as the necessities of life are at hand there is no need for plunder. The battles of these peoples are a matter of pasture

lands, cattle, slaves, women, and salt. In dry Australia it was water which caused the most feuds, and the enemy was sometimes eaten, possibly for want of game. But when the bunga bunga tree is laden with fruit so that there is plenty, foreign tribes may also partake.

Ethnology provides many proofs that just the most primitive tribes are comparatively peaceful, indeed often knowing nothing of war. Only their conversion to agricultural or to nomadic life, or the growing dearth of homeland, give rise to increasing warlike squabbles. Ratzel says of the conditions in America, "The battle of race is above all a fight for land. One may call special attention to the fact that there are also peaceful people and rulers among the primitive folk. Nor let us forget that the bloodiest and most destructive wars were not those fought among these peoples themselves, but those with Europeans, and that nothing kindled such violence and cruelty among them as the desire for profit among these highly civilized strangers, whose slave trading caused horrible slave hunting." ⁶⁶

In many of the Kurgan graves of Russia, as well as in some other prehistoric places, there are no weapons. The old Slavs were apparently a peaceful people, as one learns from a Byzantine document. According to Ross the Eskimos of Baffin Bay do not know what war is. Rasmussen, on the other hand, found extremely hostile and violent Eskimo tribes. Of the primitive Weddas one reads: "At bottom the Wedda is not of an aggressive but of a defensive character, through and through peace-loving, disposed to mildness, and as harmless and peaceable as possible. Therefore one finds also among them a hospitality and feeling for necessitous strangers." ⁶⁷ The Tierra del Fuegians also are represented as peace-loving. Moreover, everywhere strangers who ask for protection are inviolable nearly everywhere, and this too contradicts the supposition that race hatred is inborn. ⁶⁸

NOTES TO CHAPTER III

¹ Erwin Baur, Eugen Fischer, Fritz Lenz, *Grundriss der menschlichen Erblichkeitslehre und Rassenhygiene*, 2nd ed., 1923, 2 vols.

² Numerous attempts have been made to establish the acuteness of sense perceptions among primitive peoples, but they have differed very much and led to no uniform conclusion. Cf. Thurnwald, *Psychologie des primitiven Menschen*; also Basler, *Rassenphysiologie*, p. 89.

³ Baur, Fischer, Lenz, vol. i, pp. 385, 396; also W. Peters, *Ueber Vererbung psychischer Fähigkeiten*, 1915.

⁴ Cf. T. Ziehen, *Leitfaden der Physiologischen Psychologie*, 1908, p. 8 ff.; W. Wundt, *Grundriss der Psychologie*, 1907, p. 343; G. Kafka, *Tierpsychologie*, 1922; H. Bergson, *Evolution creatrice*, 1912.

⁵ G. Sommer, *Geistige Veranlagung und Vererbung*, 2nd ed., 1919, p. 20, says that the whole manner and order of the psychic development is inherited. In America W. McDougall in his *Introduction to Social Psychology*, 17th ed., 1922, stresses the supreme importance of instinct, and in his book *The Group Mind*, 1921, has also emphasized race. On the other side, Friedrich Jodl, *Lehrbuch der Psychologie*, 1903, vol. i, p. 192, says: "Among men that which he has brought with him as an inherited possession is negligible in comparison with what he assimilates in the course of life from the treasures of human tradition."

⁶ Apart from the works already mentioned of Baur, Fischer, Lenz, Sommer, and Peters, compare especially Francis Galton, *Hereditary Genius*; T. Ribot, *Hérédité Psychologique*, 10th ed., 1914; Heymans and Wiersma in *Zeitschrift f. Psychologie*, vols. xli, xlii, xlv, and xlvii; K. Buhler, *Geistige Entwicklung des Kindes*, 3rd ed., 1922, p. 36. A good survey of the newest literature is contained in the article by Robert Ambros, "Die Vererbung psychischer Eigenschaften," in *Archiv f. d. ges. Psychologie (Literaturbericht)*, vol. xxviii, 1913, supplement. The newest results are to be found in the report on the Eighth Congress for Experimental Psychology in Leipzig, publ. by K. Buhler, 1924, which gives a number of important contributions, specially one from W. Peters, "Vererbung und Persönlichkeit" (quoted as "Kongressbericht").

⁷ Cf. G. Udny Jule in *JAI.*, 1901, p. 325: *On the influence of bias and of personal equation in statistics of ill-defined qualities*. Jule shows experimentally, in opposition to Galton and Pearson, that attempts to measure statistically ill-defined qualities (e.g. mental qualities) are liable to serious errors.

⁸ Innumerable professors have married the daughters of other professors, without any specially gifted race being the result.

⁹ Cf. Erich Marcks, "Bismarck" and different reviews and discussions in the *Historische Zeitschrift*, vols. civ, cvi.

¹⁰ Wundt, *Grundriss der Psychologie*, 8th ed., 1907, p. 345

¹¹ Kafka, *Tierpsychologie*, p. 123. Cf. the interesting experiments of the canary breeder, Karl Reich, in *Mitteilungen aus der Vogelwelt*, 1922.

¹² Giese, *Allgemeine Kinderpsychologie*, p. 342.

¹³ W. Peters, "Vererbung und Persönlichkeit" in *Kongressbericht*, pp. 57, 58, 73, 75, 135, 139.

¹⁴ Already in early times the three Scandinavian nations, for example, showed distinctly different types of character, so A. Bugge, *Die Wikinger*, 1906.

¹⁵ Cf. especially G. Weiniger, *Sex and Character*, and refutation by Grete Meisel-Hess, *Weiberhass und Weiberverachtung*, 1904, Rosa Mayreder, *Zur Kritik der Weiblichkeit*, 1905, Dr. M. Vaerting, *Neubegründung der Psychologie von Mann und Weib*, 2 vols., 1923. That there are certain differences has been proved experimentally. Cf. W. J. Ruttmann, *Die Hauptergebnisse der modernen Psychologie*, 1914, pp. 302-48. But differences are not fundamental.

¹⁶ John B. Haycraft, *Natürliche Auslese und Rassenverbesserung*, 1895. Regarding the Australian criminal colonies, cf. A. Manes, *Der soziale Erdteil*, 1914, pp. 27, 57.

¹⁷ M. Lamberg, *Brasilien, Land und Leute*, 1899, p. 32.

¹⁸ Cf. C. Bouglé, *Essai sur le régime des Castes*, 1908.

¹⁹ The splendid rôle played in respect of culture by the English nobility is borne out in the material supplied by F. Galton, *Hereditary Genius*; cf. further, *A Catalogue of the Royal and Noble Authors of England, with lists of their Works*, new ed. Edinburgh, 1796, p. 339. Concerning nobility and race, cf. the interesting book by R. Michels, *Probleme der Sozialphilosophie*, 1914, p. 132 seq., which also contains pertinent remarks on cultural sterility, especially of the German nobility (p. 143). Regarding the repeatedly asserted dying out of noble families, cf. Ribot, p. 370, and Michels.

²⁰ Cf. Plato, *Protagoras*, x.

²¹ Sommer (*Kongressbericht*) tried to explain the Renaissance by the crossing of two types, namely the Tuscan nobility and the rising bourgeoisie. But the Renaissance was not limited to Italy (Shakespeare). And what crossings explain the eighteenth century?

²² German nationalists, of course, are firmly convinced that Northcliffe was of Jewish extraction, which naturally is without foundation.

²³ The main protagonist of race theories in France, Lapouge (*Race et Milieu Sociale*, 1909, pp. 53, 62), takes for granted that the Gallic element in France has almost disappeared. If this were so, the survival of the Gallic national character asserted innumerable times, would be quite inexplicable. As a matter of fact, such legends cast a strong spell on the national spirit. Numerous Frenchmen and still more Germans have tried to emulate the glorified national character of their supposed ancestors in respect of barbarian heroism.

²⁴ O. Henne am Rhyn (*Kulturgeschichte des deutschen Volkes*, 3rd ed., vol. i, p. 54) says: "History teaches that the character of the Slavs is soft and effeminate. As far as they learned to use masculine energy that seems to go back to Germanic influence, but as far as such energy is coupled with brutality it goes back to Mongolian." This historian completely forgets that the Hussites terrorized the German empire by their victories, that the German Order of Knighthood was completely beaten by the Poles and Lithuanians in 1410, that the Hohenzollerns held East Prussia during the years 1525 to 1657 only in fief from the King of Poland, and that in 1641 Friedrich Wilhelm took the oath of allegiance to the King of Poland in Warsaw, that the King of Poland, J. Sobieski, in 1683 helped decisively to save the German Empire and the whole of Christendom from the Turks, that the Croats were the cream of the Austrian army, and the South Slavs proved often that they had great warlike efficiency.

²⁵ Treitschke, *Politik*, 1897, vol. i, p. 210.

²⁶ Cf. the chapter on English music in the great history of culture by H. D. Traill and I. S. Mann, *Social England*, 1902, vol. ii, p. 509; vol. iii, p. 147; vol. iv, p. 548.

²⁷ David Hume, *Philosophical Works*, ed. Green and Grose, 1875, vol. iii, p. 244 (essay 21).

²⁸ Paul Seppel, *Les deux Frances et leurs origines historiques*, 1905.

²⁹ G. Billeter, *Die Anschauungen vom Wesen des Griechentums*, 1911.

³⁰ The differentiation between elementary and distributive was made by Steinmetz, cf. *Vierteljahrsschrift für wissenschaftl. Philosophie und Soziologie*, vol. xxvi, 1902, p. 84. The same idea is given in detail by W. Sombart, *Die Juden und das Wirtschaftsleben*, 1911, pp. 303, 389.

³¹ Gunther, *Rassenkunde des deutschen Volkes*, 1922, p. 142, calls attention to this diversity within the Nordic types. Vierkandt, p. 342, speaks of the shady side of Aryan endowment, namely the weakness of character, the one-sided development of the imagination, the extraordinary passivity of the national spirit among the Indians. But all this is in the greatest contrast to the usual idea of the Aryan character.

³² H. Taine has here especially sinned, but has also made many worthy observations. His theory of temperament is well criticized by Paul Lacombe, *La psychologie des individus et des sociétés chez Taine, historien des littératures*,

1906, p. 43. Cf. H. Taine, *Sketches on England* (French, 1871, German, 1906), E. Boutmy, *Essai d'une psychologie politique du peuple anglais au 19ième siècle*, 1903; Sombart, *Die Juden und das Wirtschaftsleben*, 1911.

³³ *Handbuch der Geschichte der Medizin* by Neuberger and Nagel, 1902, vol. i; this also contains information on the views of the Ancients.

³⁴ Weiniger, *Geschlecht und Character*; J. Bauer, *Vorlesungen über allgem Konstitutions- und Vererbungslehre*, 1923, p. 116.

³⁵ Moriz Busch, *Tagebuchblätter*, 1899, vol. ii, p. 118.

³⁶ Hans Raeder, *Platons philosoph. Entwicklung*, 1905, p. 214. Similar views are found among the primitive peoples, and the idea that the mingling of races produces conflict in the individual is to-day often discussed, e.g. by A. Fouillée, *Tempérament et caractère selon les individus, les sexes et les races*, 4th ed., 1904, p. 340 seq., and by W. McDougall, *The Group Mind*, 1921, p. 243.

³⁷ Cf. Aristotle, *Pol.*, vii, 6, Problems, xiv, 1, 8-16. On the divisions of animals, ii, 2. Further cf. *Œuvres anatomiques, physiologiques et médicales de Galien*, transl. by Daremberg, 1854, vol. i, p. 47 (Treatise on the influence of temperament on morals).

³⁸ I. Kant, *Anthropologie in pragmatischer Hinsicht*, 1798 (Works edited by Hartenstein), 1839, vol. x, p. 318.

³⁹ F. Jodl, *Lehrbuch der Psychologie*, 2nd ed., 1903, vol. ii, p. 400.

⁴⁰ Cf. W. J. Ruttman, *Die Hauptergebnisse der modernen Psychologie*, 1914, pp. 266 seq.

⁴¹ Paulin Malapert, *Les éléments du caractère et leurs lois de combinaison*, 1897, pp. 7, 189 seq., and the already mentioned book by Fouillée.

⁴² Cf. J. Bauer, *Vorlesungen über allgem. Konstitutions- und Vererbungslehre*, pp. 144, 175. Bauer also makes many remarks on race, types and inner secretions, cf. pp. 152, 159 to 179, 186, 209; cf. J. Paulsen in *AA.*, 1921.

⁴³ Ernst Kretschmer, *Körperbau und Charakter*, 1921; P. Ewald, *Temperament and Character*, 1924.

⁴⁴ A very conscientious observer, Dr W. Koppers (*Unter Feuerland-Indianer*, 1924, p. 231), says: "If one asks about the temperament of the Jagan people, I think that an almost equal mingling of melancholy and sanguinism is to be observed with also a fair amount of phlegm." A less friendly critic would certainly not have forgotten the choleric, so that all four were present.

⁴⁵ Jaensch, "Zur differentiellen Volkerpsychologie" (*Kongressbericht*, p. 177), believes to have found experimentally among French schoolchildren a specially strong stamp of the "eidetic" constitution and of the "basedowoid" type.

⁴⁶ Cf. V. Giuffrida-Ruggeri in *JAI.*, 1918, p. 99 seq.

⁴⁷ Carl Schuchardt, *Alt-Europa in seiner Kultur- und Sinentwicklung*, 1919, p. 22.

⁴⁸ W. Wundt, *Ethik*, 4th ed., 1912, vol. i, p. 284. Wundt also emphasizes the difference between tradition and instinct, the neglect of which is the chief error of race theorists.

⁴⁹ H. Obermaier, *Der Mensch der Vorzeit*, 1912, pp. 225, 260, 274; M. Hoernes, *Natur- und Urgeschichte des Menschen*; C. Schuchardt, *Alt Europa*, 1919.

⁵⁰ D. Bonhours, *Entretiens d'Ariste et d'Eugène*, 1671; J. Barbier d'Aucour, *Sentiments de Cleanthe sur les entretiens d'Ariste et d'Eugène*; J. F. Cramer, *Vindiciæ nominis germanici contra quosdam obtrectatores gallos*, 1694.

⁵¹ Cf. J. Kruger, *Untersuchung der Temperamente einer ganzen Nation usw.* (Stockholm und Upsala, 1737).

⁵² Nibelungenlied, adventure 20; cf. Waltharius, Latin poem of the tenth century publ. by I. V. Scheffel and A. Holder, 1874.

⁵³ Cf. K. Breysig, *Kulturgeschichte der Neuzeit*, 1901, vol. ii, pt. ii, p. 737.

⁵⁴ Cf. H. Prutz, *Kulturgeschichte der Kreuzzüge*, 1883, pp. 26, 60, 68 seq. In the negotiations between Richard Lion Heart and Sultan Saladin, it was arranged that the sister of the English king should marry a Mohammedan prince. Cf. *Memoirs of Almalich Almasir Saladin*, Sultan of Egypt, written by Bohadin (German edition, 1790), p. 161. Many Orientals joined up with the returning Crusaders, and from one of them is descended the German family Soltan that has produced a great many scholars.

⁵⁵ F. G. Schultheiss, *Geschichte des deutschen Nationalgefühls*, 1893, vol. i.

⁵⁶ F. von Luschan, *Völker, Rassen, Sprachen*, pp. 59, 70, 111.

⁵⁷ W. Ripley, "The European population of the U.S.A.," in *JAI.*, 1908, p. 232.

⁵⁸ Cf. Max Weber, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, 1922, pp. 216 ff., 627 seq.

⁵⁹ Emilie Ruete, *From the Life of an Arabian Princess*.

⁶⁰ Cf. Emile Haumant, *Pouchkine*, 1911, p. 14 seq.

⁶¹ His life is to be found in Dr W. Bauer's book, *Angelo Soliman, Der hochfürstliche Mohr*, 1922. After his death and in spite of the opposition of the church he was embalmed and put in a museum at the command of the Emperor.

⁶² Cf. Arthur Keith's interesting lecture on the "Group spirit among Men and Animals" in *JAI.*, 1916, and Koehler's "Forschungen an Menschenaffen", *ZE.*, 1920-1, p. 464.

⁶³ In *Mitteilungen aus der Vogelwelt* there is a case of four baby starlings who fell from their nest upon a cat. The cat smelled and licked them and the starlings nestled down. When the mother came the starlings climbed over the recumbent cat to get their food. Moreover, the mother starling was not molested by the cat. There is a fine similar case mentioned by Goethe in Eckermann's *Gesprächen mit Goethe* (8th October, 1827, towards the end of the essay).

⁶⁴ L. Gumplowicz, *Der Rassenkampf*, 1883, *Grundriss der Soziologie*, 1885.

⁶⁵ This is not quite exact. Among animals, also, there are domination and exploitation. On the other hand, in the animal world there is also a social life and sympathy, even among race-strange individuals. Cf. Kropotkin, *Mutual Help in Evolution*, Germ. ed., 1904. Kropotkin seeks to prove that even in the animal world altruistic and social feelings are stronger than the struggle for existence.

⁶⁶ Ratzel, *Volkerkunde*, 2nd ed., 1894-5, vol. i, pp. 335, 468, 563. Also Grabner (in Schwalbe and Grabner, *Anthropologie*, p. 550) asserts that primitive man on the whole is not warlike. Wanton murder is strange to him. Only on the "higher" levels is the war spirit developed. Cf. Schmidt and Koppers, *Völker und Kulturen*, vol. i, 1924, p. 188.

⁶⁷ Hoernes, *Natur- und Urgeschichte des Menschen*, 1909, vol. i, p. 523 (following Sarasin); vol. ii, p. 231, on the old Slavs; cf. also Thurnwald, *Psychologie des primitiven Menschen*, pp. 188, 190, 210.

⁶⁸ Cf. many examples in Westermarck, *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, vol. i.

CHAPTER IV

RACE AND LANGUAGE IN HISTORY

IN considering the race problem in the light of linguistic facts the following questions appear paramount:—

1. Can we infer the race of a people from the language they speak and its history? In particular, do changes in a language presuppose race mixtures and can these be traced?

2. Can the various tongues be traced back to a restricted number of primitive tongues, or even to one original stock?

3. Are languages expressive of differences of racial spirit and racial value?

4. To what degree can former cultural conditions and alien cultural influences be recognized from root affinities, borrowed words, etc.?

Above all, in considering these questions we at once come up against the Indo-European problem which indeed seems the gist of all race problems in a more narrow sense. Instead of "Indo-Germanic" or "Indo-European" we shall for the sake of brevity use the common term "Aryan", though in its true sense it should be applied to the ancient Indians and Iranians only.

THE INDO-EUROPEAN PROBLEM¹

When the linguistic affinity of the great Indo-European family was definitely discovered a sudden light seemed to shine on the relationship of races and the origin of our civilization. The primitive Aryan race from the central tableland of Asia was supposed to have sent forth the successive branches of the European nations. All nations of the Indo-European language family were accepted as essentially of the same blood and spirit. Thus even such a critical spirit as H. Taine maintained that the Aryan race from the Ganges to the Hebrides, in all zones and in every stage of civilization, and after thirty centuries of revolutionary changes, still revealed in its languages, religions, and philosophies a community of blood and mind, which to this very day unites together all its several branches.² This naive identification of language and race obtains in wide circles to this very day and not infrequently crops up even in scientific publications.³

The conception that the entire civilization of the Indians, Persians, Hellenes, Romans, as also of the Neo-Latin, Teutonic, and Slav nations was the offspring of a single race, made this race appear the most glorious flower of all human stocks, and attempts were not wanting to represent other advanced races, the Semites, Sumerians, Egyptians, Etrurians, Finns, Turks, Chinese, Japanese, Malays, Peruvians, etc., as indebted for their spiritual attainments to the alleged Aryan strain in their blood.⁴

These hypotheses identified unhesitatingly the primal Aryans with the Nordic—the Teutonic—race and efforts were made to prove by linguistics and our knowledge of prehistoric facts that the original home of the Indo-Europeans was Northern Germany or Scandinavia, and that it was from these parts that the oldest culture sent forth its rays. That the first Indo-Europeans were of the Nordic race, as Penka, Kossinna, Much, Wilser, and others assert, does not seem improbable in itself, were it not for a grave argument against this assertion, namely, the fact that it is just the Teutonic language which not only most deviates from the primitive Aryan language, as reconstructed by philologists, but to a large measure is not even derivable from it, a circumstance which surely indicates repeated race crossings.⁵ If we should assume that the Teutons on the Baltic and Northern Seas were the unalloyed stock of Aryans still inhabiting their original homes this would be inexplicable. For this same reason some modern anthropologists and linguists, e.g. Sergi, Keane, Brinston, Braun, Michaelis, see in the primeval Indo-Europeans a mixed race of predominantly round skulls, which coming from Asia forced its Indo-European tongue upon the Europeans, including the Nordics.

Many of the advocates for the Nordic descent of the Aryan uphold their thesis with great ardour, betraying by this that they are not moved by scientific reasons but by the incentive of nationalistic conceit for which, however, there seems but little reason. For even granted that the aboriginal Aryans were one with the Nordic race, history shows that far from being the first bringers of civilization, they entered history rather as destroyers, as invading barbarians who adopted only by slow degrees the higher culture of the conquered. These unpleasant facts, however, are ignored as far as possible by such authors. Most of these are Germans who feel exaltation in the idea that the Teutons always have been the active, conquering, constructive element in history, and that all culture is derived from them.⁶ One of the latest supporters for this theory in a book published during the World War saw in this

war, too, only the effervescence of the newest Teutonic wave, the outcome of which he believed could be viewed with confidence.⁷ However, to-day, and as far as we can look back in history, all nations speaking the Indo-European tongues appear racially very mixed. Indo-European is therefore a mere linguistic conception and only hypothetically can we speak of a primal Aryan race. It is evident that a fair-haired, blue-eyed Finn, whose speech is non-Aryan, is more akin to a Swede or North German of like racial characteristics than these latter are to a South Aryan, let us say a Sicilian, a Greek or a Portuguese, who in many respects will bear more likeness to a Semite or a North African. Blumenbach, the founder of anthropology, called the white race of Europe Caucasians, because the mountain tribes of the Caucasus, above all the Georgians, seemed to him the most perfect expression of this type. But just these are neither Indo-Europeans nor Nordic.

The founder of comparative philology, A. Pott, wrote a book against Gobineau,⁸ and other linguistic pioneers, such as Max Müller and O. Schrader, followed suit. Max Müller who in his first writings used to speak of the "Aryan race" manifested later on his change of view by saying that an ethnologist speaking of "Aryan race", "Aryan blood", "Aryan eyes and hair", was as great a sinner as a linguist speaking of a dolichocephalous dictionary or of a brachycephalous grammar. "It is worse," he continued, "than the Babylonian confusion, nay it is even a downright fraud. When I speak of Aryans I mean neither blood nor bones, hair or skull, I simply mean those who speak an Aryan tongue." O. Schrader says: "From the idea of primeval Indo-Europeans we must keep clear all and everything pertaining to the anthropological conception of 'race', i.e. a plurality of entirely homogeneous human beings. . . . It is highly probable that already the first Indo-Europeans were composed of somatically heterogeneous tribes and individuals." Always and everywhere new nations were formed through the blending of old ones, the subjugation or absorption of the one by the others. How could it have happened otherwise under the conditions of old Europe as described in the foregoing with the primeval Indo-European race?

MIGRATIONS AND CROSSINGS IN ANCIENT TIMES

The notion that the peoples of the Indo-European language family are also racially of closest homogeneity evidently rests upon a quite mistaken conception of social conditions in the primeval ages. The characteristic features of primitive civilization are

tribalism, the lack of ties between the several tribes, and frequent migrations. Thus Julius Cæsar found the Gauls subdivided into some eighty small states or townships. Their dwellers never scrupled either to call upon alien races for help against their own racial brethren or in aiding the enemy to subdue them. Exactly the same conditions prevailed among the Teuton nations, and therefore the supposition seems warranted that it was chiefly these continuous tribal feuds which constantly made the Teutons overflow the Roman confines like the breakers of the sea. But this was already a more advanced stage of civilization. In still remoter times the diffusion went even further. We only find very small groups, tribes, consisting of a few closely connected families, each of these small tribes forming the germ for a new race and language. According to Pliny, when the Romans were negotiating with the 300 tribes living in the small country of Colchis, they needed 130 interpreters in order to make themselves understood. In California there were found about 150,000 aborigines speaking 135 different languages and dialects belonging to 21 several linguistic families, so that one dialect was spoken by barely more than a thousand people, and each linguistic group numbered but seven thousand.⁹ Some known languages are restricted to a small number of families each intelligible to their neighbours only. In primitive times such fragments of tribes were continually shifting, sometimes on natural highways, following rivers or woodless tracts of land, or attracted by rich soil, or they were whirled about like chaff in the wind, pushed up by stronger enemies. The nomad owing to the requirements for food for his cattle is forced to move onward from scantily yielding soil: therefore large tribes cannot be formed. Increase of population leads to further splitting up and the formation of new tribes, who then seek their pastures in more distant regions.

Even more unrestrained than the wandering herdsmen who through their cattle are bound to certain regions, are the hunter nations; and freest of all are the seafaring inhabitants of straggling groups of islands, such as those of the Polynesian Archipelago, which is the most eminent example of this kind.¹⁰ The Malayan-Polynesian tribes in fact have spread over the enormous area of 210° of longitude and 80° of latitude and they covered this extent, as many indications show, in the comparatively short space of time of a few centuries. Ratzel reports cases of smaller groups drifted by the sea-currents over stretches of several thousands of miles; the frequency of such involuntary migrations in many cases accounts for the intermingling of races. Most efficacious, however, in this

respect was deliberate colonization even as early as the Stone Age—a splendid proof of the all-conquering expansiveness of the human race. The Scandinavian Vikings pushed their raids as far as Byzantium; Normans founded a kingdom in Sicily; the Vandals in Africa. In Swedish tombs more than 20,000 Arabian silver coins were found, and these Vikings doubtlessly also carried off very many Eastern women.¹¹

Not less far reaching were the migrations of the Red Indian tribes, some of which since their discovery have moved great distances from their original homes. Some tribes used to travel in a single year as many as from 1,500 to 2,000 kilometres for the purpose of buffalo hunting. The war-path led these tribes even farther, and this always brought with it an intermixture of tribes. Nomads will perform a ten or twenty days' journey for the mere sake of robbery. The Bantus in a short time spread their speech over 40° of latitude, i.e. two-thirds of the whole length of Africa, yet their dialects show no greater differentiation than perhaps that between High and Low German. Then came the Arabs and pressed upon them, and spread over the whole of Africa with a surprising swiftness despite their scanty political power, leaving everywhere deep-lying vestiges of their presence. Conditions in different parts of Africa are graphically described by explorers like J. Hahn and Schweinfurth: the endless feuds, the incessant fluctuating and migrating of peoples, the infinite variety of linguistic, racial, cultural, and psychological traits caused by the mix-up of nations. Where slaves are not considered as mere beasts of burden, but as helpmates of the household, as is the case in the Islamic countries, slavery also contributes a great deal to race mixing.

With a great many tribes the remarkable custom of exogamy (taking wives from alien tribes) prevails. On the causes of this many arguments have been raised. As exogamy is practised in all directions, the infiltration of alien blood may extend very far. Even in some parts of Europe there still exists, at least among rural populations, the practice of taking wives from other villages. In exogamy, properly speaking, however, this is not the question of a mere usage but of a moral postulate whose infringement is considered a sort of incest.

Commercial intercourse also which, by the way, in remote times was closely bound up with piracy, war, and the slave trade, promoted race mixture. Indications of commerce between the North of Europe and far distant Southern and Eastern countries can be

traced back till the early Stone Age.¹² In the Homeric poems the Phœnicians appear as traders and cunning kidnappers. Their offshoot, the Carthagians, founded numerous settlements in the Greek Isles, in Lower Italy, Gaul, and Spain. An Assyrian inscription from the time of Sardanapalus (930 to 905 B.C.) runs : " in the seas where the north star stands in zenith your merchants were fishing the yellow amber." The Nordic amber which can easily be ascertained by chemical examination indeed appears in Asia Minor about 1500 B.C., and on the other hand cowries and Phœnician objects have been found in the Baltic lands. The Greeks covered all the coasts of the Mediterranean and Black Seas with their colonies, unquestionably also a considerable factor of race mixing. The Vikings were no less great as traders than as pirates.

WAR AS A FACTOR IN RACE MIXING AND THE FORMING OF NATIONS

The most powerful race mixer, however, was war. The more warlike a nation appears in history, the more mixed we may assume it to have become. Cattle and foreign women were the chief objects coveted in primitive warfare. In the Lesser Antilles the Spaniards¹³ nearly everywhere encountered the curious fact that the female section of the people spoke a different tongue from that of the male : this gave rise to all kinds of fabulous accounts until it was discovered that the women spoke an Aruak dialect, while the men spoke the Carib language, though in a form greatly influenced by Aruak. The Caribs had only recently conquered the Antilles, and the women of the Aruak had become their booty. Thus it became a custom that men and women spoke different tongues in succeeding generations also. However, the influence of the mothers on the speech of the children was often the stronger one. In a similar way, in the whole of America an intense mixture of races was effected ; in the Arctic regions of America the Mongolian Eskimos and the Red Indians merged into one race. Likewise as regards the plateau of Central Asia, whence according to a still popular assumption the Aryans came, the custom of distributing the women of the vanquished among the victors and of pressing their young men as soldiers into the conqueror's army is mainly made responsible for the ethnic intermixture.¹⁴ The same facts have been reported frequently from Africa and America. At the dawn of Roman tradition stands the rape of the Sabine women.

After the victories of Emperor Claudius II over the Goths all the Roman provinces were crowded with Teutonic slaves ; to ever

Roman soldier two or three Gothic women were allotted. The Roman armies in later times were an important factor of race mixing. Teutonic mercenaries played a considerable rôle in Roman Egypt, and African and Oriental troops were encamped in Germany. In the household of a Roman Governor in Egypt there lived a Teutonic soothsayer of the name of Walpurga, as we gather from a recently discovered papyrus. In A.D. 384 the Frank Merobaudes was chief commander of the Roman troops in Egypt.¹⁵

Geological indications make it probable that long periods of drought in Central Asia from two to three thousand years B.C. gave the incentive for vast migratory movements of peoples directed towards more fertile regions, and those migrations probably in many cases caused the loose agglomerations of small nomad tribes to unite into larger bodies. The Huns also when they first broke into Europe were divided into small independent tribes and only later united under the lead of a great warrior, Attila. The circumstance that China barred the way towards the East was the cause of this avalanche of peoples turning westward carrying along with them all the tribes they met with on their way. Teutons and Slavs fought on the side of the Huns and mingled with Mongols.¹⁶ This first Mongol domination in Europe lasted for several generations and cannot but have left vestiges in vast sections of the Continent. In this case the vitality of Roman civilization prevailed and the nomad was driven out. But the typical course of events is different. The ease and well-being of the tiller of the ground allures the rude but more vigorous nomad who overcomes the former and makes him his tributary bondsman or slave, and therewith the process of fusion of the two races sets in. The warring dominators exhaust themselves in continual feuds, the vanquished, containing many higher civilized elements, know how to render themselves indispensable to their lords and in their service frequently rise even above the freeman. This, according to Tacitus, was common among the Teutons. From the amalgamation of the conquering lords and the women of the vanquished frequently arises a mixed race which afterwards in the course of time absorbs both tribes.

It is, to be sure, not the cultural superiority, nor necessarily the greater number which secures the military victory of one race over another. We see in history in many instances a handful of invaders subdue vast countries in which they form but a very small racial minority, the Turks and Arabs for instance. The great masses of the people were usually quite indifferent to such changes of rule : they were dominated and exploited before by a small minority

and had nothing to lose by the change, in some cases they might even hope for an alleviation. Military victories, moreover, often depend on contingencies, such as better arms or the possession of horses, or luck. Above all it seems to have been the superior skill in using metals which often turned the balance. The so-called Horus race that subdued the aborigines of Egypt and founded the first dynasties, brought with them an accomplished metal culture, while the aborigines still used stone implements only. In Egyptian inscriptions the attendants of the Horus frequently appear as smiths. When the Japanese conquered Japan they knew the use of bronze and even iron, while the aborigines had stone weapons only.¹⁷ These, the Ainos, were, according to one of the best experts, Mr. Bälz, closely akin to the present-day Europeans and are counted among the white races which originally inhabited a large portion of Asia and only later in history were driven westward by the Mongols.¹⁸ The first followers of Mohammed, the Yathribites, made headway for Islam not merely by their heroic defiance of death but also by their better equipment, especially by their dressing in mail.¹⁹ According to Roman tradition it was the superior armament of Æneas which induced the natives of Latium, who had only stone and wood weapons, to submission.²⁰ Herodotus emphasizes that the Persians were by no means behind the Greeks in courage and strength, but they had no armour, more primitive arms, and were not so well trained in tactics as the Greeks who fought in mail-coats.²¹ Ancient historians report that the Teutons despite their indomitable courage and enormous strength "were slaughtered like cattle" almost without any casualties on the side of the better armed and tactically more experienced Romans.²² Only after having become themselves Roman mercenaries did the Teutons learn how to overthrow the Roman Empire. It also appears that a considerable number of the Teutons were once under Gallic rule, evidently owing to the superior iron culture and armament of the Celts.²³ In front of the Greeks and Romans, however, the Gauls were but poorly armed. It strikes one that the nations of the North as compared to those of the South for a long time made but little use of metals, despite the richness and facility of their mining possibilities.²⁴ For this reason, too, the theory of the original Aryan speaking tribes having their origin in the North of Europe is rather doubtful, because they would not have been able to conquer the better armed nations of the South.²⁵ Therefore it is quite incongruous when Professor Eugen Fischer maintains that the Red Indians were not "intelligent" enough for the discovery of iron

and copper making. According to Luschan's theory, which to-day is generally accepted, production of iron was discovered by the Negroes, who on Egyptian monuments are frequently represented in the act of offering iron as tribute.

Apart from nomadic tribes of the desert, vigorous mountain dwellers also, especially where plateaux, such as in Assyria, Persia, Peru, Mexico, Macedonia, favoured more extensive gatherings of people, ever and again founded warlike states and invaded and conquered the plains. In many cases these mountains also abounded in metals. Thus by gradual amalgamation small tribes grew into great nations and temporarily even formed world empires. Great conquerors, such as Alexander, always attempted the fusion of the several conquered peoples, even when of heterogeneous races, into one political nation. Frequently also the conquerors adopted the language and culture of the more civilized vanquished. In many cases conquerors, in order to break the national resistance of the vanquished, tore entire nations from their native soil and transplanted them into foreign countries. The best known example of this kind is the Babylonian captivity of the Jews, which led to the development of the Christian religion. Previous to this the Assyrian king Sargon had sent the conquered Israelites away from their country and settled them in Assyria and Media, i.e. in the midst of the Aryan-speaking populations; this ruler repeatedly transplanted entire nations from one end of his empire to the other and the Arabs did the same thing under Harun-al-Raschid. The Chinese went even further and by the systematic mixing of tribes they attained their present uniformity of national features. Also military colonization for the purpose of frontier protection contributed a great deal to the intermixture of races, as is shown by the Roman military colonies. The Teutons first appeared as war prisoners, then as Roman auxiliaries and mercenaries, and finally as conquerors, in many European countries, and even in Africa. Charlemagne in the course of his twenty Saxon wars repeatedly led away as many as a third of the entire Saxon population, each time tens of thousands of people, and settled them in distant parts of his empire; their country was colonized by Franks and heathen Slavs, those that had lent him help against the Saxons. Thus the same Charlemagne who often is exalted by German writers as a "national" statesman was the one who slavized large portions of Saxony such as for a thousand years had been purely German.²⁶ There has been no war since the remotest times which has not effected a mixture of races. As a curiosity it may be mentioned

that as late as 1795 a regiment of Mohammedan Tartars took service with the King of Prussia and was settled in the newly won provinces. Also the German Emperor Charles IV favoured Mohammedan immigration to Bohemia; in the Swiss canton of Valais it is said that there occur to this day certain Saracen types, remnants of a former Arabian invasion. We only mention the Magyars, who many times overran the greatest part of Europe in the tenth century, the Mongol and the Turk inroads, the widespread colonizations of German settlers throughout Eastern Europe, the Crusades, the re-colonization of the devastated parts of Hungary after the expulsion of the Turks, the modern colonization of the overseas countries, and the inner migrations in consequence of the attraction exercised by the big industrial centres.

LANGUAGE NO TEST OF RACE.

The belief that the wide geographical distribution of a language family must necessarily be a proof of the civilizing capacity of those who speak it is utterly erroneous. The range of the Indo-European language, for example, has been greatly surpassed—irrespective of modern colonization—by the spread of the Ural-Altaic and the Austric languages.²⁷ The Ural-Altaic language family extends from Finland as far as Japan; and the Austric includes all regions between India and the coasts of South America. This evidently depends on the circumstance that the bearers of the Ural-Altaic tongues, e.g. the Mongols, owing to the physical nature of their continent, persisted for a comparatively long time in nomadic habits of life, and that the Polynesians had for their expansion the practically boundless possibilities of the sea. The early expansion of a language family therefore only proves that its original bearers remained for a longer time than other peoples at a primitive nomadic or semi-nomadic stage of civilization, having thus larger opportunities to conquer higher developed sedentary tribes, whom they then absorbed into their own language family. Thus also the enormous extent of the Indo-European languages as compared to the much smaller Semitic area is explained chiefly by the fact that most of the Semitic tribes were already settled and tied to the soil by agriculture at a period when the Aryan nomad or semi-nomad still carried his language over the continents.²⁸

Moreover, the present Semitic language area appears to us much larger than it was at the time when the Aryan languages had already attained their widest expansion in Europe, because one small

Semitic tribe, the Arabs, who had remained nomads, suddenly rushed forth from their abodes and semiticized vast regions. Secondly, the development of Hellenism, the growth and extension of the Roman empire and recently also of European colonization spread the Indo-European languages over enormous regions, certainly an evidence of the cultural vitality of the bearers of these respective languages.

As a rule it was always the culture of more advanced but weaker races that fell the prey to the physically stronger Indo-European and Semitic nomads; and the elements of civilization of these great groups of peoples are largely inherited from other races, subdued by the sword.

Widespread language families are also met in Africa; here too topographical features and social conditions favoured migrations and conquests. In contrast to this no large language families could develop in America, where the original inhabitants, despite their small number, belonged to about 150 separate language families,²⁹ and spoke some 1,000 different tongues. This astounding linguistic variety stands in striking contrast to the pronounced uniformity of their racial features. All Red Indians evidently are of a single race, and yet exactly these possessed such an unparalleled multitude of languages. This clearly shows how little the mere belonging to different language families, i.e. the Aryan, Semitic, Hamitic, Ural-Altaic, is indicative of difference of race.³⁰ The linguistic disruption in America was due probably to the fact that the Red Indian tribes, with few exceptions, never developed beyond the state of scattered roaming hunters, the most natural for them, considering the abundance of game in their country. Nomad tribes such as would have brought about an amalgamation did not exist in old America, as this continent was then lacking in animals fit for domestication such as would have made possible the development of nomadism. The llama alone in South America could not make up for the lack of horned cattle, horses, sheep or swine. The bison is not domesticable. The lack of these economic elements probably accounts for the original linguistic, political, and cultural disconnectedness of the American mainland, and therefore America and also Australia, where the physical conditions were still less favourable, had no powerful race to oppose successfully the incoming of the European, a circumstance which made the development of a "New World" possible. American philologists accept as proved that in the tongues of certain tribal groups, who separated only at a relatively

recent epoch, the common elements have already been lost in the divergencies.

When the conquerors did not intend to settle permanently in the invaded country they often had but little interest in enslaving the males of the vanquished, slave labour being of value mainly for tilling the ground. Therefore they killed the males and distributed the females among themselves. In such cases the language of the conqueror prevailed, but it was subject to certain modifications brought about through the influence of the alien women's speech, for it is from the mother³¹ that the children learn, while the father is absent from home on hunting expeditions or on the warpath. Quite otherwise is the development where a thin stratum of less civilized conquerors only superposes the subdued tillers of the ground, with the intention of living on their labour. In this case it will mostly be the speech of the subdued, who are by far greater in number, that obtains. Also the children of the dominating class, growing up together with the children of the serfs, acquire this language, and the following generation already begins to forget the language of its forefathers. As a rule it was the aristocratic conquerors, whose domination merely rested at the point of the sword, whose tongue underwent such a change, but it also happened with colonists. The Spaniards in some parts of South America adopted Indian dialects and forgot their own tongue; the Russians in certain Siberian districts speak the languages of the natives. In France, the conquering Normans discarded their own language for French and in England for the Anglo-Saxon. The Franks in Gaul, the Longobards in Italy, and the Goths in Spain adopted vulgar Latin, the Mongolians dominating China the Chinese, the conquering Turks in Persia the Persian. It was far otherwise when the invaders to a great extent were peasant colonists backed by the administration of a well-organized bureaucracy. Such were the means by which Rome succeeded in spreading her language nearly everywhere she went within a very short time and without compulsion.³² Iberian Spain and Celtic Gaul to this very day speak the language Rome gave to them; the Teuton who in these two countries ruled quite as long as did Rome yielded up his own tongue to the foreign one. Britain once was as much Romanized as Gaul. Gildas, who lived at the time of the Anglo-Saxon conquest, says: "*Ita, ut non Britannia, sed Romana insula diceretur.*" Here the Teutonic idiom prevailed. China was not less successful than Rome in communicating her language to foreign races. Many close relatives of the "Aryans" speak Chinese to-day. Numerous Slav peoples

in the Balkans when adopting Islam accepted with it the Turkish language. The Bulgars, on the other hand, were a Finnish-Turanian tribe, that is to say, closely related to the Turks ; but they adopted the language and nationality of conquered Slavs and have preserved them up to this day. In the Balkan wars people of Turkish race fought on the side of the Slavs, and even more Slavs sided with the Turks. The Arabs communicated their language with a " miraculous swiftness " to all vanquished races, although their conquest was of the aristocratic nature and although in the beginning it was prohibited to the conquered to use the Arab language or script.³³ This is explained by the fact that they were at the same time bearers of a rich civilization which they had adopted from the Greeks, Syrians, Persians, Egyptians, and Jews. The Fellahs who have preserved well the old Egyptian type, to-day speak Arabian and so do the Berbers, who are closely akin to the white Europeans, and the Nubian Negroes. All these believe themselves to be of Arabian extraction and glory in this belief. The Bantus, who spread their language over an enormous area comprising the most diverse racial types, have already been mentioned. The Irish to a great extent adopted the English language, but on the other hand a great many settlers from Scandinavia were Celtized, and so were many Anglo-Saxons. The Celtic language, once prevailing perhaps over the greatest part of Europe, has now disappeared nearly everywhere, but the blood of the Celt remains. The descendants of the non-Aryan Rhaetians in Switzerland and Southern Tyrol speak German or Romansh, those of the Etrurians, who were akin to the Rhaetians, Italian. The Negro slaves caught up corrupted forms of the languages of their respective English, French, Dutch, and Spanish masters. The greater part of the aborigines of India have adopted the Aryan tongues. Dirr rightly says : " There are few nations, perhaps not a single one, that has not in the course of history changed its language. Some even several times." ³⁴

Change of language in most cases goes hand in hand with racial crossings, but the two phenomena need not necessarily run parallel. The French language is predominantly vulgar Latin, Celtic stems being only of rare occurrence, although the Celtic idiom may have influenced it to a great extent as regards phonetic peculiarities. And yet the Roman strain in the French blood cannot be of any great thickness³⁵ ; by far the greater number of the actual French are of Celtic, Teutonic, Iberian, and Ligurian extraction. The Iberians and probably the Ligurians too spoke non-Aryan languages. Lapouge, by the way, is of opinion that the Celtic strain is very

insignificant in the blood of the French of to-day.³⁶ Neither is there need for long spaces of time for a change of language! The Romanization of Gaul was brought about in a few centuries, the Normans of Rollo one hundred years after the conquest spoke only French; in vast areas of Northern Germany, where to-day only German is spoken, Slav dialects prevailed but a few generations ago.

Mere cultural influence, without the necessity of a warlike conquest, may bring about a change of language. Thus Hebrew was crowded out from Palestine by Western Aramaic, and the same would have been achieved by the Greek language but for the brutal oppression of the Jews, which provoked a Jewish national reaction. The Greek Bible in wide circles of Palestine had already displaced the Hebrew one. The Babylonian language, too, gave way to the Aramaic.

The important part migrations and conquests played in the formation of languages is also corroborated by philological research. J. Schmidt³⁷ showed on the grounds of a rich linguistic material that the single members of the Indo-European language family do not stand among each other in direct relation of descent. The degree of relationship between neighbouring languages is not the same throughout the line, so that a language in one respect may be related to one of its neighbours and in other respects more nearly to others. This is obviously to be explained by the assumption that the languages, spreading like concentric waves, were carried in all directions by small tribes. Afterwards single tribes obtained an ascendancy over others and spread their originally local dialects over vast spaces, this resulting in the former gradual transitions becoming abrupt breaks and widening the gulfs between languages.

Also the profuse abundance of synonyms in the languages of the more primitive peoples probably is explained in part by numerous crossings, though it is also due to the fact that primitive peoples have a more concrete way of thinking. Lacking abstractions they form separate words for every concrete thing. The Lapps, for example, have separate words for all the several species of the reindeer, 20 words for ice, 41 for snow in its different forms, 11 for cold, 26 for freezing, thawing, etc.³⁸ Yet crossing must also be considered as a concurrent factor in the enrichment of languages. If the father and mother speak different languages this of necessity leads to a richer and mixed vocabulary in the child. As long as heterogeneous elements coexisted within one people the greater part of different languages was retained, and only

subsequently, after a definite amalgamation, did a proper selection of words take place.

Thus the dispersion of a language family over a certain area need not of necessity imply a corresponding dispersion of a definite race. The best example in this respect is offered by the history of the Neo-Latin languages. Their common root is Latin, whose bearers, the Romans, were by no means predominantly "Aryans", but had to a large extent already absorbed Etrurians, Ligurians, and other pro-Aryan elements. In later times the Roman soldiers who spread the Latin language over the then known world, were mostly not even Romans but Oriental, African, and Teutonic auxiliaries and mercenaries. Likewise the peoples who adopted the vulgar Latin speech largely spoke non-Aryan languages, Iberians in Spain, Ligurians and Iberians in Gaul, a nondescript chaos of races on the soil of modern Roumania.³⁹ In more recent times, the Spaniards brought the language which originated from Rome to the Red Indians of South America, and the French did the same with respect to the Negroes of the West Indies. In a like manner other Aryan tongues spread to the dark Dravidas of India and the fair complexioned Finns of northern Eurasia. Yet even scientific writers ever and again commit the error of assuming that most of these peoples and their culture are predominantly "Aryan", because to-day they speak Aryan languages.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE ARYAN AND OTHER LANGUAGE FAMILIES

Comparative philology has traced, and still goes on tracing, relations between the great linguistic groups which partly point to a common source of origin, and partly seem to be the result of ethnic or cultural intermixture. Some modern authorities have even advanced the theory that all languages may be traced back to the same source.⁴⁰ Numerous parallels between the Semitic and the Indogermanic tongues had already been observed many years ago by Frederic Delitzsch, who drew up a list of some fifty root equations. Since then more recent research has made the Aryan-Semitic affinity more and more plausible until finally Hermann Möller could compile his *Comparative Dictionary of the Indogermanic and Semitic Languages* (1911).⁴¹ The ancient Egyptian language forms a bridge between the Semitic and the North African (Hamitic) idioms. As far back as 1806 Adelung, the father of German etymological research, noticed numerous analogies between

the Turkish, German and Slavonic tongues, that is between the Ural-Altaic and the Indogermanic language families. He notes, for example, 247 instances of Turkish-German root affinities. Three-quarters of a century later on Tomaschek, Koeppen and others furnished numerous contributions to the further elucidation of this question,⁴² and in recent times many linguists have detected a strong relationship between the Indogermanic and 'Caucasian' dialects.

The leading German authority in African philological research, G. Meinhof, is of opinion that the entire Hamitic-Semitic-Indo-European language group must be considered as interconnected; on the other hand the Hamitic languages are connected with those of the Bantu Negroes, the Ful language forming the transition between these two.⁴³ The idea of an affinity between the Indo-European-Hamitic-Semitic and Bantu languages, was, by the way, advanced by S. Reinisch. The relations between the Basque and Hamitic, and Basque and Caucasian, and between the African, Asiatic, and Australian languages, have also been adverted to, the last pointing towards America.

A very learned linguist, Albert Drexel, tries to prove that the Aino language is a link between languages of the old and the new world, between Asia and Europe on the one hand, America and Australia on the other.⁴⁴

Vast material has been collected by F. van der Velden,⁴⁵ who says: "Much of the raw material of the language, of the roots as well as of the stems, is common to the Indogermanic and non-Indogermanic languages of Asia and Europe. . . . That the Semitic languages have some root affinities with the Indogermanic has long been evident to all but those who do not wish to see and the connexion between the Indogermanic and the Ural-Altaic languages can only be denied by one who, as Hommel puts it, is utterly wrong in his head." This scholar's studies, moreover, extend also to the connexions between the Indogermanic and the Caucasian and non-Aryan languages of India, and even include Bantu. Non-Aryan remnants in European languages have been traced, especially in the Alpine countries, as is shown by an analysis of the Bavarian dialect and the Romansh patois in Switzerland. Also anthropology, prehistory and classical historical traditions corroborate the view that the oldest stock of the Alpine populations was formed by non-Aryans. "Mountain countries of difficult access, which on account of their scanty fertility are not much coveted by conquerors, are remarkably slow in undergoing foreign influences

in race and language. The same languages whose remains to-day are found only in remote Alpine valleys, once prevailed also in the surrounding hill countries and plains, from whence they have long since been swept away by fresh waves of peoples, or, if still existing, been transformed beyond recognition." High mountains are therefore, everywhere like ethnographic museums, conserving the remains of once mighty races. Their blood continues to live within us; their languages have disappeared. Van der Velden draws the following conclusions from his comparative researches: "The people who spoke the original Indogermanic language proceeded from the very same ethnic sources whence also the Semites, the Ural-Altaic and other peoples came, for they all once passed together through common stages of language development. Moreover, the Indogermanic speaking peoples kept in constant touch by cross-breeding with non-Indogermanic tribes as is proved by the reciprocal borrowing not only of words, but also of myths, religions, notions, and folklore, such as recur all over the world." Anthropological studies, too, lead him to the same conclusion. The author concludes: "Thus the inquiry into somatic characteristics strongly corroborates the evidences furnished by philological research, namely that the Indogermanic peoples, linguistically as well as somatically, have their roots in non-Aryan peoples, with whom they are everywhere crossed and with whom in both their physical and intellectual features they are nearer related than they in their West European conceit are willing to admit."

LANGUAGES AND CULTURAL VALUE

Wilhelm von Humboldt says in the introduction to his great work on the Kawi language ⁴⁶: "Between the mental peculiarities of a nation and its ways of linguistic expression there exist correlations of such intimacy that, if the one be given, it should be possible to deduce the other from it entirely. Language is the outward appearance of the national spirit of a people; its language is its spirit, and its spirit is its language; one cannot go too far in identifying these as one and the same."

Here we have the romantic conception of language expressed in a classic form. Already Rousseau, a romantic, too, asserted that languages in their "pure" state were the expression of the intimate feelings of the very soul of the peoples.⁴⁷ But he only finds this "pure" language among southern nations. With the Northerners

the constant necessity of reciprocal aid has, according to Rousseau, led to a utilitarian form of speech. "The first word of the Southerner was 'aimez-moi', that of the Northerner 'aidez-moi'." J. G. Fichte, on the contrary, saw an inestimable advantage of the Germans over the Romanized Teutons, by which he meant above all the French, in the circumstance that the Germans had preserved their own original language which, pouring forth from the depths of their innermost nature is a living organism, while the Latin speech assumed by the Romance peoples is essentially uncongenial to their beings and therefore in their mouths a dead instrument of a mere conventional significance. For this reason the Neo-Latin nations have only spirit while the Germans also have a soul. On this assumption Fichte builds the highest hopes for his people, but he also emphasizes that racial purity is not here the point, as all Teutonic nations to a greater or lesser degree are ethnic intermixtures.⁴⁸

Later on materialistic tendencies and other factors caused the transformation of the romantic conception of a "national spirit" into a "racial spirit". Ever and ever again the notion has cropped up that the language of a people is the characteristic expression of its racial spirit. A distinguished sociologist of Berlin University, Professor A. Vierkandt, once maintained that higher intellectual qualities must be attributed to the Aryan and Semitic groups of peoples for the mere fact that their languages show a higher structure, possessing a real verb, a differentiation of genders which in other groups is but rarely found, and a true inflexion. Furthermore he finds "an unmistakable indication of superiority of the Aryan race" in the fact that the Aryan languages conceived the auxiliary verb "to be" which is wanting in the Semitic tongues, this being a sign of their extraordinary power of abstraction.⁴⁹ Dr. O. Reche, professor of anthropology at the University of Vienna, also considers language to be a product of racial spirit⁵⁰ and deduces from linguistic differences that also the mental and intellectual dispositions of the nations necessarily must differ greatly from one another. He even goes so far as to argue that the German-Americans by having abandoned their national language have fallen into a state of mental decay. Another Viennese professor, Hüsing, maintains that logical forms and grammatical structures have their roots in somatic peculiarities and therefore are constitutional and inalienable, and that one can hardly exaggerate the differences between the several linguistic families.⁵¹ Professor Fritz Graebner recently expounded the theory of a close connexion between

psychological language types and cultural development, though he did not emphasize race.⁵²

At a glance it seems that race influences at least quickness and articulation of speech; yet experience shows that children when growing up from babyhood in foreign racial environment learn to articulate the foreign language as perfectly and idiomatically as natives of the race they live among. In the same way, to some degree, language certainly reflects the national character of a people, but national character is a matter of history and tradition⁵³; and even in admitting this we must avoid going too far. The assertion that language is the perfectly true reflection of the hereditary mental and intellectual disposition of a people and that differences of language are indicative of profound differences of mental disposition is, however, quite unfounded. The greatest authorities in the domains of linguistic science, among them even those who regard language as the incarnation of the mental individuality of a nation, decline emphatically the interpretation of linguistic facts in the sense of racial superiority or inferiority; thus Misteli, Steinthal, Wundt, Schuchardt, Meillet, F. de Saussure, H. Paul, H. Hirt, Fritz Mauthner and others.⁵⁴ Misteli says that distinction of linguistic types does not include the preferential valuation of one race in comparison with others. Language differences may indicate a diversity of mental dispositions, yet this is not identical with differences in cultural capacity. Misteli refrains from further expounding this idea of a correlation between language and national spirit, restricting himself to occasional remarks on the subject. Thus, speaking of the Semitic languages, he says that they are remarkable for the depth of their living, powerful, spirituality, which appears also in the religious emotionality of the Semites, an opinion diametrically opposed to the characteristics of Semite religiosity given by many other writers, among them H. S. Chamberlain. Wundt points out that each of the several languages developed distinct sides of common human nature and that therefore absolute valuation seems impossible. "The inference in particular," he says, "from linguistic forms to fixed racial features of a psychical nature, is utterly inadmissible." Wundt specially rejects also the attempts of James Byrne and F. N. Finck to draw conclusions from linguistic forms as to racial temperaments. Paul denies the concrete existence of such a thing as "national spirit" and apostrophizing Wundt, exclaims: "Away with this abstraction!" Intercourse alone engenders speech; racial descent plays "a very subordinate part". Saussure calls it an error to

consider 'speech as the expression of race.' Jordans argues interestingly to the same effect. Hugo Schuchardt says: "that race, as such, exercises an immediate influence on language has never been proved." The same authority altogether declines the conception of language as a natural organism; to his mind language is a manifestation of a social order, and is often an inextricable mixture which makes it impossible to sunder original affinities and subsequent foreign influences.

Meyer-Lübke, on the other hand, called the "Nigger-French" a "rude adaption to an entirely different linguistic genius". But this is emphatically contradicted by Schuchardt who finds nothing African in "Nigger-French" and maintains that the habit of thinking in no way differs from that of French children. Fritz Mauthner considers that a valuation of languages on the basis of their structural peculiarities is a fanciful play and stigmatizes this forcibly as a superstition. H. Hirt repudiates the assertion that the Indo-Europeans because of their language can lay claim to superiority and points out as an example modern English, which is the most ground off and at the same time the most developed of all the Indogermanic languages, but which as regards structure stands nearer to the Chinese than to the Indogermanic.

Until a short time ago the division of the languages into isolating, agglutinant, and inflectional types was considered the mainstay of the linguistic science. And yet these types are only, as Schuchardt has it, stages with manifold transitions between them. Moreover, as already shown, it is just the languages of the primitive peoples which often evince a surprising richness in vocabulary. In many cases primitive languages also show a hypertrophy of forms and a most complex grammar, betraying by this a comprehensive memory and a keen power of classification in its possessors. Thus it seems quite hopeless to draw conclusions from a language as to the intellectual standard of those who speak it. "While the savage hunter-folk of the Bushmen," says Ratzel, "are possessed of an ingeniously constructed and rich language, we find uninflectional Chinese, the most simple of tongues, according to evolutionist views, with its 450 radicals which, like the pieces of a puzzle put together and then taken asunder, still remain unchanged practically without any sort of organic connexion with one another, is spoken by a people who developed the most perfect and durable civilization of Asia." Misteli also points out the striking difference between the admirable spiritual achievement of Chinese thought and its simplicity of linguistic means.

Among the European languages English is the poorest morphologically, while the Slav languages are of a highly complex structure. According to the race theory, therefore, the English language would betray less cultural capacity than the Slav ones !

Max Müller quotes Darwin's contemptuous judgments of the inhabitants of Tierra del Fuego : " At the sight of this people," he said, " one can hardly persuade oneself that they are fellow-men and fellow-inhabitants of the same planet. Their language scarcely merits the name of articulate speech." Captain Cook likened it to the sounds produced in clearing one's throat. But subsequently this language was found to have a stock of 32,430 expressions, which seems rather considerable when one considers that the rich world of Shakespeare is contained within the compass of 15,000 words. Also their alleged physical disfiguration has been recognized as a gross error since Virchow's exhaustive investigations.⁵⁵

G. v. d. Gabelentz says : " When I consider the easy and infinitely rich flexibility of let us say an Ural-Altaic or a Philippine language ; or the variety and subtle shades of expression in the verbal forms of the Santal speech, despite the simple linguistic means at hand, I cannot help thinking that we, with a much greater waste of energy, have but attained comparatively mediocre results." ⁵⁶

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

¹ For the Indo-European problem compare especially Q. Schrader, *Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte*, 1907, and the smaller work by the same author, *Die Indogermanen*, 1914; Hermann Hirt, *Die Indogermanen*, 2 vols., 1905-7; S. Feist, *Kultur, Ausbreitung und Herkunft der Indogermanen*, 1913, and also the smaller work by the same author *Indogermanen und Germanen*, 1914.

² Paul Lacombe, *La psychologie des individus et des sociétés chez Taine*, 1906, p. 14.

³ Even such a universal and cautious sociologist as Paul Barth says in one of his early works that the Persians, being Aryans, possessed a greater political capacity than the Semites, as is proved by the long duration of their empire (Barth, *Geschichtsphilosophie Hegels und der Hegelianer*, 1890, p. 140). But the modern Persians are a mixed race, composed of Iranian, Turkish, Mongolian, Semitic, Armenian, and Caucasian elements, their rulers in recent times were Turks, and nearly all the Persian soldiery were Turks (Ratzel, ii, pp. 573, 604, 608). In Barth's own periodical (*Vierteiljahrsschrift für wissenschaftliche Philosophie und Soziologie*, xxvi, 1902, p. 106), the well-known ethnologist Steinmetz asks why the political genius of the Aryans has never shown itself in the miserable conglomerate of the Persian Empire. It also seems queer that Herman Hirt (*Die Indogermanen*, 1905, i, p. 105), styles Buddha as a "genuine Aryan", and claims his doctrine to be the incarnation of the Aryan spirit. What reasons can one give for this? And how can one explain the fact that Buddhism to-day is found almost exclusively among the non-Aryans, chiefly among Mongolian nations? Usually the Aryan spirit is described as active, fighting, enterprising, insatiable, etc., which is the opposite of Buddhism.

⁴ Cf. Gobineau; also Woltmann, *Polutsche Anthropologie*, 1913, p. 287, and numerous writings by Wilsen, Arldt, and others.

⁵ Hirt, vol. i, pp. 175, 196; Feist, *Kultur*, pp. 450, 466, 484-5, 510.

⁶ Professor Kossina expresses this even in the title of his book, *Die deutsche Vorgeschichte, eine hervorragende nationale Wissenschaft*, cf., on the other hand, Schopenhauer's sharp remarks in his *Parerga*, § 265, on Patriotism in Science.

⁷ Cf. T. Arldt, *Germanische Völkerwellen und ihre Bedeutung in der Bevölkerungsgeschichte von Europa*, 1917.

⁸ Pott, *Die Ungleichheit menschlicher Rassen, hauptsächlich vom sprachwissenschaftlichen Standpunkte*, 1856.

⁹ A. L. Kroeber, "The Determination of Linguistic Relationship," *Anth.*, 1913, p. 396.

¹⁰ Cf. for the following Ratzel, *Anthropogeographie*, vol. i, 2nd ed., 1899, pp. 113-208; also Ratzel, *Völkerkunde*, vol. i, pp. 150 et seq., 162, 568, 593; vol. ii, pp. 191, 207. In modern ethnology the theory of "diffusion" has won great importance. It explains cultural parallels by migrations over sometimes incredibly huge distances. Cf. W. H. R. Rivers, *Psychology and Ethnology*, 1926.

¹¹ O. Montelius, *Kulturgeschichte Schwedens*, 1906, p. 270. The Viking chieftains often kept hundreds of women of the most divers races shut up in the Oriental manner in harems. A. Bugge, *Die Viker*, 1906, p. 85.

¹² Hoernes, *Natur- und Urgeschichte*, ii, p. 500 seq.; Hirt, i, 317, 395 seq.; Schuchardt, *Alt-Europa*, pp. 42, 59.

¹³ Cf. F. N. Finck, *Sprachstämme des Erärkreises*, 1915, p. 92; Haebler in Helmolt's *Weltgeschichte*, ii, p. 136.

¹⁴ H. Schurtz, "Hochasien und Sibirien" in Helmolt's *Weltgesch.*, ii, p. 136.

¹⁵ Cf. W. Schubert, *Aegypten v. Alexander d. Gr. bis Mohammed*, 1922, p. 333.

¹⁶ In warlike expeditions and in migrations heterogeneous races often combined for common action either freely or forcibly. Thus the Cimbri and Teutons were a Celtic-German mixture as is proved by the Celtic names of their kings and by the fact that the Romans availed themselves of Celtic speaking spies against them. Together with the Vandals and the Suevi wandered the Alans, a Caucasian tribe of non-Teuton, probably not even of Aryan speech. Flinders Petrie ("Migrations," *JAI.*, 1906, p. 189) gives a comprehensive view of the migrations by the twenty most important nations of the time of the great European migration.

¹⁷ W. Belck, *ZE.*, 1907, p. 334, tries to show that the manufacture of steel was an invention of the Philistines, whom he associates with the Phœnicians, while all the other nations of Anterior Asia for a long time remained quite ignorant of the use of iron, especially of hard iron. This theory, however, has not found much acceptance. It is noteworthy that in the alluvial soil of Egypt and Babylon neither copper nor iron ore has been found; in Egypt both these metals for a long time were very rare. Iron was everywhere used rather for implements, because only the soft qualities could be produced. The Greeks attributed the invention of iron and steel to the Chalybians, south-east of the Black Sea. This, as Blankenhorn remarks, coincides with the Biblical sayings and is corroborated also through finds of enormous prehistoric piles of slag in Paphlagonia, Pontus, and North Persia.

¹⁸ Cf. Balz, "Die Ru-ku-Insulaner, die Aino und andere Kaukasische Reste in Ostasien," *Kbl.*, 1911, p. 187 seq., *ZE.*, 1907, p. 281 seq. W. Gowland, "The Metals in Antiquity," *JAI.*, 1912, p. 235 seq.

¹⁹ Hell, *Kultur der Araber*, 1910, p. 35.

²⁰ Sextus Aurelius Victor, *Origines gentis Romanæ*, cap. 13.

²¹ Herodot., ix, 62; cf. also vii, p. 61 seq., v, 49.

²² Die Cassius, xxxviii, 45-9; Cæsar, *Bell. Gall.*, iv, 5; Florus, i, 31 seq. Tacitus, *Annales*, ii, 14-21.

²³ Cf. Cæsar, *Bell. Gall.*, vi, 24. This is upheld also by weighty considerations of a linguistic nature. Feist goes so far as to advance the opinion that in Germanic speech was brought to the Teutons by the Celts alone. Hirt, i, 174, Feist, *Kultur*, p. 482 seq.

²⁴ In order to effect the liquefaction of iron in the Austrian Alps sufficient to employ surface iron ore for the construction of a hearth, a steel could be made in a very simple way. Cf. A. Mullner, *Geschichte des Eisens in Inner-Oesterreich*, 1909.

²⁵ Professor Ridgeway (in *JAI.*, 1909) states that iron and bronze were first used in Central Europe for weapons, and that the fair, tall, blond, and blue-eyed races, who were the first to use iron, were the same as those used then when conquering Greece. This, however, is not in accordance with the generally accepted views on the first use of metals in the Near East. Cf. also A. H. Smith, *Excavations in Greece*, and the testimony of Homer.

²⁶ Cf. Dahn, *Urgeschichte der germanischen und romanischen Völker*, 1883, pp. 1008, 1019, 1043, 1058, 1061, 1066, 1106. Cf. also A. H. Smith, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*, 1905, p. 39, and Lamprecht, *Deutsche Geschichte*, ii, p. 139.

²⁷ F. N. Finck, *Die Sprachstämme des Erdkreises*, 1915, pp. 43, 59.

²⁸ By a curious mistake many of our racial dogmatists speak of the Semites as of "nomads", trying to explain their national character by their "nomadic instincts". They ignore that the North Semites (the Assyrians, the Babylonians, the Persians, etc.) were settled from the first, and that the South Semites (the Arabs, the Ethiopians, etc.) were nomads from the first. One must beware of the conception that between nomadism and settled life are sharp contrasts; many transitions occurred. In Europe the nomads existed side by side, and also that the tillers were not always fixed to the soil, but moved on whenever compelled by natural causes. Schrader, Hirt, and Feist discuss this question.

²⁹ Cf. Finch, p. 68, Buschan, *Völkerkunde*, 1923, vol. i, p. 59.

³⁰ Anyone venturing the thesis that the Red Indians on a

r.

CHAPTER V

"NORDICS," ARYAN AND OTHER ELEMENTS IN EUROPE PREHISTORIC CONNEXIONS

WE shall now essay to combine anthropological and linguistic investigations and to discuss the question of whether Europe is predominantly Nordic. For the purpose of this examination we shall accept the thesis of the race theorists that Nordics and Aryans, or the Germanic peoples, were originally identical and in this same sense we shall speak of an Aryan race.

Prehistoric research shows that cross breedings of human races have been going on in Europe since the remotest times.¹ The earliest and lowest type found in Europe is the so-called Neanderthal man; parts of skeletons of this race have been found in Germany, Belgium, France, Croatia, and Moravia. The skull in many of these is nearer the animal form than even the lowest racial type of our time. It is dolichocephalic in shape, but for one is dolichocephalic variety found near Krapina in Croatia. In 1921

was found a skull very nearly resembling in shape that of the Neanderthal man, unearthed in South Africa,² and some authorities advanced

the opinion that this race, coming from Africa in the primeval period, was dispersed over Europe. Of more recent origin is the long-headed Cro-Magnon type from which evolved in all probability

the Celtic and the Mediterranean races, that is to say, principally the *Bevolkerung*

of Pott, of Europeans, Aryans, Semites, and Hamites. Besides these some round-skulled types have been found at Grenoble,

1913, p. 39. Ofnet, Mugem. These probably have some connexion

with the present-day Alpine races. They very likely came from the plains of a distinctly Negroid race of small stature and

great importance have been found in the Grimaldi caves near Mentone, and in 1926

finds have been made also in other parts of Europe, from the south of France to the Russian plains.³

From this epoch have come down to us a series of ivory figurines, representing human beings with apparently African characteristics, especially characterized by enormously broad buttocks.

An example of this is the so-called "Venus of Willendorf," a village in Lower Austria.

found near Willendorf, a village in Lower Austria.

found near Willendorf, a village in Lower Austria.

As during the diluvial age Europe and Africa were connected with each other by a bridge of land, many authorities, among them Luschan, Hoernes, Verneau, Sergi, Brinton, Hervé, Classen, suppose that, when the glacial period was over, the thinned out European population was filled up by infiltrations from Africa. And indeed the distance between Central Europe and North Africa is hardly more than 1,000 kilometres, while the Indogermanic and the Ural-Altaic language families have spread over a distance of 8,000 kilometres, leaving modern colonial expansion out of the question. Pigmy races are alleged to be traceable especially in the Swiss Alps, in France, in the Rhine valley as far as Worms, and in Silesia ⁴; Pliny also speaks of pigmies in the Alps, and folklore has preserved their memories. Among the present-day Europeans certain types crop up occasionally which strongly remind one of African pigmy features.

Attempts have been made to locate the origin of culture and the routes of early migrations with the help of archæological evidence. The best authorities in prehistoric and linguistic science suppose the original source of all culture to have originated in the East from whence it gradually spread all over Europe. As opposed to this Salomon Reinach, Ludwig Wilser, Mathæus Much, Gustaf Kossinna and others maintain that the North of Europe, which most of them believe also to have been the cradle of the Indogermanic race, independently evolved most important inventions which from there found their way towards the South and the East. But the best Nordic authorities, Sophus Müller and Oskar Montelius, reject this theory,⁵ and stick to the old hypothesis of the Oriental origin of culture. Schuchardt, for one, looks mainly upon Western Europe as the oldest cultural centre. For our purpose this question is but of a secondary importance, because that there existed sure connexions between prehistoric pottery and other objects and particular races can hardly be established ⁶; on the other hand, the primitive elements of culture in question might just as well have been invented independently in different parts of the world. Some advocates of the Nordic hypothesis, for instance Wilser, venture so far as to ascribe to the North even the invention of the art of writing. This, however, cannot be accepted by any competent scholar. An outstanding fact cannot be refuted, namely, that at a time when Europe still slept in the dusk of a primordial state of civilization, there existed in the south-east a great city, Babylon, which possessed a very high material and intellectual culture, and was endowed with a far-reaching civilizing power.

PRESENT DISTRIBUTION OF RACES

The North of Europe is the focus of the light-pigmented tall, long-headed Nordic or Teutonic type whose purest expression is found in Scandinavia, England, North Germany, and Finland, and which, as a component part of manifold racial crossings has penetrated most of the other European countries. In the South, on the other hand, all around the Mediterranean coasts, there dwell the long-headed brunets, mostly less tall in stature, and more slender than the Nordics. The area between these two is filled up by the brunet, rather short and stout, square-headed Alpines, whose centre of gravitation is in the Alps, from whence they shade off in various gradations over South Germany, Bohemia, Eastern France, Upper Italy, and the East of Europe. To a lesser degree the Alpine type is met with also in Holland and even in Norway.⁷

Besides these three principal European races, according to Deniker one may distinguish two more types, namely the blond, more round-skulled "Eastern race" prevailing in Eastern Europe (Russia, Poland) and a very tall, round-headed and predominantly brunet type that Deniker calls the "Adriatic" or "Dinaric" race. This Dinaric race has as one of its most distinctive traits a prominent aquiline nose, and has its home chiefly along the eastern littoral of the Adriatic from the Balkans as far as the Tyrol. Deniker also subdivided the Mediterraneans into two distinctive groups, the one of a tall stature and mesocephalic head, the other long-headed and short-statured. Besides these he indicated some two or three varieties more.

Special mention should also be made of a thick-set, broad-headed, flat-nosed Mongoloid type with high cheekbones, evidently of Asiatic origin, found in various degrees of intermixture in the extreme north of Europe (Lapps) and also in the East (Russia, Finland, Hungary, Bohemia).

These various types, as here described, are to-day generally recognized as the constituent elements of the European racial conglomerate, but they are to be met with to no small extent far beyond the confines of Europe. The fair complexioned Nordics have been declared by some authorities to constitute the original Indogermans. Others, however, see in the brunet, round-headed Alpines the original bearers of the Indogermanic languages. These Alpines expanded in a broad belt down the Danube far into Asia, and by some anthropologists have been brought into connexion with the Mongols (E. Fischer). Luschán believes them to be closely related to races dwelling in Asia Minor, especially with the ancient

Hittites, whom on the other hand he believes to have formed one of the chief components of the Jewish people. More recent researches rather tend to see in the Dinarics a spur of Oriental races protruding into Europe, a possibility which in view of the sometimes strikingly Oriental noses of the Dinarics could not fail to suggest itself. The Mediterranean type unquestionably dominates also in North Africa and in large parts of Anterior Asia. Some anthropologists have also propounded the hypothesis of a common origin of the Mediterranean and the Nordic races.

Professor H. I. Fleure, moreover, described a peculiar kind of brunet and extremely long-headed type still to be found as ethnic fragments in some out-of-the-way parts of Wales, England, and Scotland. This race which also shows some Negroid characteristics, protruding mouths, flat noses, etc., once extended over vast parts of Europe and is met with also in Africa, Arabia, Australia, and even South America. This race in all probability came to Europe from Africa, perhaps also from South-Western Asia. Professor Fleure attempted to prove that in prehistoric times they split into two branches, of which the one migrated north and settled round the Baltic Sea, developing through environmental influences of a climatic and geological character its present blond and Nordic features, while the other branch formed the Mediterraneans of the South. A lateral branch of these, Fleure suggests, are the Semites.⁸

THE NORDIC TYPE IN GERMANY

That in present-day Germany, especially in the south, the Nordic or alleged "Aryan" types form only a minority, has been proved already by a census of eye and hair colour of German school children taken in 1880 at the instance of Professor Virchow. In its perfect purity the Nordic type is rare in Germany. The longest-headed of all German tribes are, according to Virchow's measurements, the Frisians; but these, this anthropologist argues from the peculiar shape of their crania, seem to be no true Teutons, but of a more primitive, or Neanderthaloid derivation. Virchow found among the Frisians 18 per cent true long-heads, 35 per cent medium long-heads with a tendency to long-headedness, 31 per cent round-heads, and the rest medium heads tending towards round-headedness. Waldenburg,⁹ who measured the Frisians of the North Sea islands, came to the surprising result that long-headedness—if there ever was any there—has disappeared entirely from these people till now regarded as the purest Teutons. No less than

87.7 per cent of the individuals measured were decidedly round-headed, 42.5 per cent even extremely so !

In South Germany long-heads have been almost entirely displaced by round ones. To quote one example for many, Kollmann counted among the skulls from old Germanic tombs in Bavaria 48 per cent true long-heads, and only 11 per cent true round-heads, while Ranke among the living population of the same districts only found 1 per cent true long-heads, and 83 per cent true round-heads. Even more striking is the contrast between the former and the present population in the Rhine district and in Swabia. Ammon found the pure Nordic type in Baden amounted to only 1.45 per cent of the individuals measured.

The focus of round-headedness combined with dark pigmentation and thick-set stature is in the Alps ; from there this racial type spread over the whole of South Germany, crowding out the "Germanic" types. Zbinden, who examined the Swiss conscripts, failed to find among them even one specimen of the pure North-European type, and even in crossings the Nordic features seldom predominated.¹⁰ Frizzi found among 1,000 Tyrolese skulls 42 per cent hyperbrachycephalic, and a like percentage of brachycephalic forms. Giovanozzi found 88 per cent round-skulls among the Tyrolese measured by him. This anthropologist also draws attention to the relative lowness of the Tyrolese crania, perhaps a Mongoloid characteristic.

During the world war extensive anthropological measurements on German prisoners were taken in England,¹¹ the results of which may be summarized in the conclusion drawn that Germanic racial characteristics are more common in England than in Germany, where they evidently have been partly replaced by Alpine and Slavonic types. The average cephalic index of the English was found to be 78.24, of the Germans 82.5.¹¹ In no German province is it below 80. (The term dolichocephalic is applied to skulls with an index below 75.) It is interesting to note that the average cranial capacity of the German war prisoners was found to be considerably greater than that of the British soldiers, and even somewhat greater than that of British students. From 38 to 50 per cent were dark types, even among the North German prisoners; while in South Germany the percentage of darks was from 79 to 99 per cent.

Ripley says on the ground of distribution of "Germanic" racial characteristics : "The North-Eastern third of France and one-half of Belgium are to-day much more Germanic than South Germany."

The chauvinist francophobes among the Germans forget as a rule that France was the country of the Franks, the Visigoths, the Burgundians, and Normans, peoples to whom Germanic race cannot be disputed. * Starting from a different point of departure, Arbois de Jubainville, Celtic philologist, arrived at the conclusion, namely, that in France it is the Teutons and in Germany the Celts who form the chief stock of the population. South Germany has considerable strains of Celtic, Rhaetian, and Ligurian blood, and in many parts of Northern Germany the population is predominantly of Slavonic descent.

The prevalence of "non-Teutonic" features in South Germany, however, cannot be accounted for, as has often been attempted, by the admixture of Celtic blood; for the Celts, according to the evidence of some ancient writers, had the same physical traits as the Teutons; they, too, were blond, fair complexioned, and tall. If Nordics and Aryans are really identical, then we must admit that the Alps and their surroundings harbour, for the most part, ethnic elements of "non-Aryan" derivation. The graves of the Teutonic period predominantly show the Nordic type; evidently less care was bestowed upon the burial of the subdued non-Aryans.¹² But in the course of time the non-Teutonic type seems to have got the upper hand throughout South Germany, Austria and elsewhere. Only in the North German plains the Teutonic type forms the majority and even there it seems questionable as to whether the Nordic features in a given individual may be taken as an absolute proof of Teutonic descent because the original Slavs also seem to have been blond, blue-eyed, and long-headed; and previous to the advent of the Slavs North Germany was probably inhabited by Mongoloid Finns, these too are a very light-pigmented and, when not crossed with Laps, long-headed race. The German language in many parts of North Germany is of but recent origin, and many a Teutomaniac glorying in his blondness may be owes his proud distinctive sign to Slav or Finnic ancestors. The German cultural centre of gravitation, moreover, lies in the land of the round-headed and relatively dark Swabians and Franks, and not in Mecklenburg or in Pomerania, where the long-headed blonds are most numerous. As already said, the displacement of the Germanic by non-Germanic racial traits might also be accounted for by environmental influences, such as intensive brain work, better food, mountainous surroundings, instead of racial crossings, but this theory is rejected by race dogmatists.

The truth is that neither of these two theories seems consistent

with the race dogma. We must either admit that the present racial status of Europe is the effect of extensive crossings in historic or prehistoric times ; then we have no reason to ascribe all the merit of our European culture to one race only, be it Aryan or not ; on the contrary, we must in fairness own, that all the various elements of the European racial conglomerate have had each a share in this achievement, and that it is not possible to determine to which the biggest is due : or we make local and environmental influences responsible for the variegated racial appearance of Europe. This, however, would imply a surprisingly strong and quick-working effect of environmental conditions, and we would have to assume that man is made of an exceedingly plastic material, an assumption which at once must shatter the whole structure of the race dogma built, as it is, on the invariability of the extant races.

One might also imagine that in crossings between Nordics and non-Nordics the characteristics of the latter remain dominant, so that in such blends the Aryan features are always pushed into the background (Eugen Fischer). But should we then not be compelled also to admit the preponderance of the mental patrimony of the non-Nordic races as regards European civilization ?

NORDIC TYPE AND ANCIENT CLASSIC CULTURE

Much space is taken up in the theories of the race dogmatists by the allegations that the ancient Hellenes and Romans were much more Nordic-Aryan than the present-day Greeks and Italians, among whom the Nordic types now form but an insignificant percentage of the population.¹³ These Nordic elements, they maintain, brought about the florescence of the classic culture, while their extinction or dilution was the cause of its fall. We shall in the course of our disquisitions return to this chief argument of all race theories ; here we have to discuss only the anthropological aspect of the question, and for this purpose it will suffice to consider the Hellenes alone.

That among the several races from the fusion of which the ancient Hellenes proceeded there was also a Nordic element is, for more than one reason, highly probable. The modern Greeks, as Luschan shows, are composed of a long-headed element (cephalic index 75) and an extremely round-headed one (index 88). The long-headed types presumably have their roots partly in a Nordic, and partly in a Mediterranean (Semitic ?) element. The round-heads seem to be the descendants of an ethnic stratum of Western Asiatic origin which seems to be traceable also in prehistoric Greek skulls.¹⁴

Round cranial and facial characteristics are indeed distinctly marked also in some antique sculptures, of which the most conspicuous examples are the busts of the greatest of all the Greeks, Socrates, and his disciple, Plato, whose original name was Aristocles, but who, according to Neanthes, was dubbed Plato (i.e. the Broad) on account of his broad forehead.¹⁵ The physiognomy of Socrates especially was markedly un-Nordic. As a proof of the distinct preponderance of the Nordic element in the racial compound of old Hellas some modern authorities have brought into prominence the frequency of blondness among the ancient Greeks. It is true there exists evidence to this effect, dating from the fifth century A.D., namely, the relation of a Jewish physician named Adamantios, who described the hair of the Greeks as inclined to blond or light brown in colour, and as soft and wavy in texture ; but this description is somewhat ambiguous and more of a poetic than scientific character.¹⁶ Blond or light brown hair also is often given by the poets to youthful heroes, as indeed blond hair in juveniles is not unfrequent even among very dark peoples. Representations of an artistic or poetical character, in any case, are not to be valued as anthropological evidence, for they notoriously are often influenced by erotic or æsthetic predilections, such as the well-known partiality of dark males for blond women, a factor which may have contributed also to the frequency of blond beauties in mythological and erotic pictorial representations in the works of art of the Ancients and of the Renaissance, where the males on the same paintings at times are dark. Aristophanes ridicules Cleon as "pyrrhopipes", that is one who ogles after golden-curled boys. It seems that the blond type was more frequent among juveniles. One must not overlook the fact, moreover, that the term "xanthos" commonly translated by the word "blond" in reality comprises all shades from yellow to brown, and is applied, for instance, also to sunburnt skin, horses, cattle, bees, roast meat and earth, objects which cannot exactly be qualified as yellow.¹⁷ In the same way it is open to doubt whether the epithet "glaukopis" applied to Pallas Athene means blue-eyed or bright-eyed, or whether it is not derived from the owl, the symbolic bird of this goddess.¹⁸ To later generations, at least, the conception of blue eyes seems to have appeared rather queer. Pausanias (i, 14) thought it necessary to explain the blue eyes in a statue of Pallas Athene as due to an African (Lybian) legend ; and Diodorus (i, 12) refers to the Egyptian conception of the blue eyes of this goddess being only the symbol of the azure air of which she is the ruler, for it would be absurd,

he says, to believe, as some Greeks do, that her eyes were really blue.

In the pseudo-Aristotelian *Physiognomics* blue eyes are said to be a sign of courage and spirit, while white-blue (light blue ?) eyes and also "too much black", yellowish and greenish ones, are indicative of cowardice. The same work contains a great many interesting remarks from which one may gather that the ethnic material observed must have been of a highly multiform character.

The mere fact that the blondness of the Teutons, Gauls, Scythians, Thracians, etc., struck the ancient Greek as something strange must be regarded as a proof that fair people were not common among them. Herodotus (iv, 108) speaks of a Nordic tribe, the Budines, who were all blond and blue-eyed, and he expressly says that these people are dissimilar in face and colour from the Hellenes that live among them. It is also remarkable that the Greeks picture their highest gods as being dark-haired. Xenophanes points out that the Negroes imagine their gods to be black and flat-nosed, while the blond Thracians believed theirs blond and blue-eyed. Had blondness been the rule among his own people and their gods, Xenophanes would surely have quoted the Greeks as the example nearest at hand. And just the greatest of the Greek gods, Zeus and Hera, were represented as dark-haired (*Iliad*, i, 528 ; xv, 102 ; xvii, 209). Poseidon is called the "black-curved god" (*Iliad*, xiii, 563 ; xv, 174 ; xx, 144 ; *Odyssey*, ix, 536). Even Apollo, who as a sun-god had a fair claim to blondness, in pictorial representations was conceived as black-haired. Sophocles expressly says¹⁹ that, although the poets call Apollo golden-curved, no painter would venture to paint him with golden hair instead of black, because the picture would then be disparaged. And likewise in his *Antigone* the chorus speaks of black as the common hair colour, just the same as Plato in his *Statesman*.

The statues of youthful deities, and especially of goddesses, according to Athenæus, were given blond hair ; and indeed in many ancient works of painted sculpture traces of this are still visible. Also red paint was frequently used for the hair, as may be seen in Tanagra statuettes and in many other sculptures.²⁰ Paintings and mosaics show black and brown hair as well as blond.

In a tympanum group from the Acropolis Zeus has blue-black hair and beard, while Heracles, standing before him, is blond.²¹ Pallas Athene is sometimes figured with black hair,²² sometimes with red. On the Greek vase-paintings, of which an extraordinary large number have been found, the figures are nearly always black-

haired, though also red, yellow, and white heads occur. The black-figured vases, on the contrary, always show the typical pointed red beards combined with black hair, this combination evidently having suggested itself for pictorial reasons, namely, because of the necessity to make the beard stand out against the black body, and the hair against the red background. To what length ancient artists sometimes were influenced by such considerations may be seen from the two wonderfully realistic antique Negro heads in the Berlin Museum (Nos. 2,203 and 4,049) where only the hair has been left unpainted. From the foregoing we may assume that lighter types were certainly not infrequent in ancient Greece, but as a whole the population was certainly dark complexioned.

Greek sculptures of the Archaic period or style are often remarkable for slanting, almond-shaped eyes, even goggle-eyes, huge noses, a "frozen" smile, pointed protruding beards, curly hair, and other un-Nordic, nay Asiatic features.²³

But such forms can hardly be considered as attempts towards life-like artistic representation; they are simply stereotype copies of traditional Asiatic or Egyptian forms, at times determined in style by religious or superstitious traditions. But Greek portrait busts of the later period also often look anything but Nordic.

The results of anthropological research are also confirmed by historical or linguistical evidence. A glance at the map of Europe suffices to show the pre-Aryan influences in the geographical names of nearly all countries, and the same holds good also as regards the history, language, and mythology of all European nations.²⁴ The languages of the pre-Aryans have disappeared nearly everywhere, but their descendants assuredly still live among us, and they too have contributed to build up the edifice of European civilization.

THE PRE-ARYANS IN GREECE

The ancient Greek historiographers frequently expatiate about the Pelasgi and the Lelegi, who in remote times inhabited the peninsula and spoke a language which was different from that of the Hellenes. The whole of Greece, Thucydides states, was once held in the possession of the Barbarians. Herodotus relates that in his own time the tongue of the Pelasgi could still be heard in some localities and that this tongue was a Barbarian speech.²⁵

Scholars for a long time slighted these unmistakable testimonies

of the ancient writers, but modern research finally proved them true in every respect. Kretschmer, Kiessling, Fick and others furnished ample proof for the supposition that in prehistoric times the whole of Greece and Asia Minor was populated by a single race which was neither Indogermanic nor Semitic, but an independent group of its own. Phonetic laws, word formation, and vocabulary are exactly the same on both sides of the Ægean Sea. The fact is, that geological considerations make it evident that in a not very far distant epoch of the history of the earth, land was where the Ægean Sea is now, and the mountain tops of this land formed the Isles of Greece. By this bridge of land it was that in olden times the Asiatic race passed over to Greece and farther on northwest as far as the Alps, where they constituted the racial stock of the peoples living there. At a later period, when the barrier of the inland lakes in the Danube plains had disappeared, there followed from the north the immigration of the Indogermans, which resulted in the Hellenization of Greece. In this way Greece became a land of ethnic inter-mixture. "Even our learned lexicographers," says Kiessling, "lay stress upon the fact that a considerable part of the Greek vocabulary cannot be explained etymologically, because it is of alien, non-Greek derivation."

This is especially striking in geographical names, of which the great authority Heinrich Kiepert asserts only an insignificant percentage are of true Greek origin. They cannot be explained, Kiessling adds, either from the Greek or the Indogermanic, and just the best known names baffle all attempts at derivation; Athens, Tanagra, Argos, Mycenæ, Tyrins, Thebes, Corinth, Olympos, Parnassos, Larissa are true foreign words in Greece.

The conformity of the geographical names in Greece and in Asia Minor is obvious. The Carians in particular, once the most important tribe of Asia Minor, have left a great many conspicuous vestiges in Hellas, such as the sanctuary of Zeus Karios in Boetia, the castle of Karia in Megara and Kar, name of the legendary first king of this township; and even Aristotle relates that the province of Argolis—the part of the Peloponnesus just opposite to Athens—was formerly inhabited by Carians. Herodotus, who, though a native of a Dorian town, was Ionian and Athenian in his innermost heart, states that the Ionians, and more particularly the Athenians, were originally Pelasgi and that they only later on adopted the Hellenic speech, in contradistinction to the Dorians who were genuine Hellenes.²⁶ Thus just the one Greek tribe which

created the noblest part of Greek culture and whose pre-eminence is attested by the names of Athens and Homer, was of non-Hellenic extraction.

How thoroughly the Hellenes had been influenced by non-Aryan elements is visible also in their mythology and their culture in general. Speaking of this, Curtius says: "Proud as the Greeks were of their autochthony, they yet connected everywhere the foundation of their social life with the advent of highly gifted strangers, who being endowed with superhuman strength and wisdom established a new kind of order in all relations between man and man."²⁷ Semitic deities, religion and folklore, he says, inextricably fused with the Greek national and cultural consciousness, as one at once realizes when thinking of the myth of Cronos, the Titans, Heracles, Minos, and Moloch. Even such a specially Aryan god as Zeus was given a Semitic adoptive father. Most of what this famous historiographer of the Greek world believed to be of Semitic origin has since been recognized as non-Semitic; nevertheless there still remain unquestionably Semitic influences of great moment. Herodotus says that the gods of the Hellenes came from the Pelasgi.

In recent times the science of the spade has brought to light in Crete a prehistoric culture of undreamt-of splendour. It reaches as far back as the fourth millennium B.C., and attained its zenith in the second millennium; it forms the connecting link between the civilizations of the ancient Orient, Egypt, and Greece. Its direct offshoot is the Mycenæan culture, but it sent forth its light far beyond the boundaries of the Greek world and a flash reached the very midst of the Austrian Alps, in the so-called Hallstadt culture, a striking evidence of the connexions between Anterior Asia and the European Alps. The bearers of this Cretan culture were evidently that Asiatic race of which mention has already been made. The pictorial representations still extant show that there was little Nordic in them.²⁸ The well-known discoverer of this sphere of civilization, Sir Arthur Evans, in a lecture delivered in 1912 before the Society of Hellenic Studies, pointed out that Greek civilization has for a long time ceased to be considered as a unique prodigy, because it is now known that it has its roots in a preceding Cretan culture and its ramifications. One can hardly go too far in estimating the value of these influences on Greek cultural evolution. Also Heinrich Bulle says that Cretan art as regards genius of conception is in nowise behindhand that of the subsequent Greek development.

THE LIGURIANS

Another widespread race of ancient times was the Ligurian or, as the Greeks called them, the Lygian people, whose language has entirely died out. The importance of the Ligurians becomes evident from the fact that the geographer Eratosthenes named the whole of western Europe the Ligustic Peninsula. Their principal centre in Italy was the territory around the Gulf of Genoa, from whence they expanded over the basin of the River Po whose original name was Bodincus, a Ligurian word. The Ligurians also went southward as far as Mount Vesuvius, which is likewise a Ligurian word. They occupied, furthermore, a large part of the Alps, Southern France, and the North of Spain, where they crossed with the Iberians. Tacitus mentions a widely spread people of their name in Germany. Numerous geographical names are derived from their language, for instance Alps, Rhine (isonymic with the rivulet Reno near Bologna), the German name of the Lake of Constance, Bodensee (same root as Bodincus), Geneva (cf. Genoa), the rivers Main and Moselle, Worms, perhaps also Vindobona (the ancient name of Vienna), and so on. According to F. Stolz the Ligurians formed the chief stock of the original population of the Tyrol.²⁹

That the Ligurians were of non-Indogermanic stock is a well-established fact laid down by Müllenhoff. It should be noted also that the classical historians found traces of them even in Anterior Asia, evidently their country of origin. In Italy they were displaced by the Etruscans, in most other countries by the Celts. These latter, whose wide range of dispersion is still recognizable in a great number of place names in Germany, Austria, and elsewhere, furnish a striking proof of how even a mighty race is wiped out from the surface of the earth.

THE ETRUSCANS

The Etruscans (Tusci, Tyrrheni or Tyrseni, the Tursha of the Egyptians) left behind them some 8,500 inscriptions and a manuscript found in Croatia; their language, however, has remained sealed to us till to-day. Only one fact seems established beyond all doubt, namely, that they were not Indogermans nor Nordics.³⁰

According to classical tradition (vide Herodotus, i, 94) the Etruscans came from Asia Minor. Some of them settled in the isle of Lemnos, opposite the Asiatic mainland, where their once presence is evidenced by inscriptions; their main body, however,

wandered further on and took possession of the whole of Upper Italy from sea to sea, with Etruria (present-day Tuscany) ³¹ as their centre. In South Italy they occupied Campania. Livy (v, 33) says of them that previous to the advent of the Romans they ruled far and wide, by land and by sea, and that the two seas by which Italy is bounded, the Tuscan and the Adriatic Sea, bear Etruscan names.

• In their struggle with the Romans they had already attained the upper hand when all of a sudden their power collapsed on account of their being attacked simultaneously, as if by common accord, in the North by the invading Gauls, and in the South by their Italic neighbours.

Rome was for some time under their domination. According to Roman tradition the Royal dynasty of the Tarquinii had come from Etruria, and in fact some members, Tarquinius, Tanaquil, Aruns, bore Etruscan names. Also the words Rome, Tiber, and the names of the most ancient Roman families are of Etruscan origin. Schulze ³² summarizes his comprehensive research in this respect as follows: "Thus in and around Rome Etruscan family names are met with in such abundance that we must take them into account when considering the origin of the Eternal City. Rome herself, says Dionysius of Halikarnassus, was by many historians believed to be an Etruscan city. The study of the history and development of the Latin language, to which I must here purposely restrict myself, geographically illustrates the Roman legend connecting Æneas with Tarchon and Tyrsenos. The Tiber near Rome was once, as the poet says, a Tuscan river. And beyond the Tiber the Etruscan tribes penetrated far south and founded many cities." It is Roman tradition also which ascribes an Etruscan origin to one of those original Roman tribes from the union of which the city took her birth. In many arts and handicrafts, but especially in architecture, the Etruscans had gained a high standard of perfection, they were the teachers of the Romans. Roman religion likewise evinces Etruscan influence. Tombstone inscriptions seem to indicate matriarchal institutions.

Etruscans also settled to a considerable extent in the Alps. Roman historians distinctly say that especially the Rhaetians, who inhabited the Grisons, the Tyrol, Vorarlberg, Upper Bavaria, Carinthia, and Carniola, were of Etruscan stock. Livy (v, 33) says: "The Alpine tribes also are doubtless of Etruscan origin, especially the Rhætians, who under the influence of their environment, relapsed into barbarism—preserving from their former state

nothing beyond the sound of their speech, and even this not unspoiled." Also Trogus Pompeius, of whose historical work Justinus gives us an abstract, says that the Rhætians came from the Etruscans (Justinus, xx, 5).³³ These evidences from classical authorities have been confirmed in our times by numerous discoveries of Etruscan inscriptions and objects found in Tyrol, Carinthia, Carniola, and the Grisons, near Bozen, Matrei, Sondrio, Nonsberg, Hallstadt, Watsch, St. Margarethen, Dellach, and other places. It should be mentioned also that Steub³⁴ first traced the derivation of many place names in Tyrol from Etruscan roots, and in this was supported by leading philologists and archæologists, among them Mommsen, Müllenhoff, and Pott. The small village of Rum near Innsbruck probably comes from the same Etruscan root as mighty Rome.

The physical type of the Etruscans has come down to us in pictures, statues, etc. Mommsen³⁵ on the authority of the classical historians, states that in stature they were dissimilar to the tall Hellenes and Romans; they were of a short, thick-set growth with large heads and brawny arms; in paintings they appear rather dark, though besides some with coal-black hair, some light blond ones were found. They seem to have resembled in some ways the Alpine type, but most of the crania found in Etruscan tombs are dolichocephalic or mesocephalic, evidently of the Mediterranean racial type.³⁶ In all probability there existed two distinct racial types within the Etruscans, for we know that this people was divided strictly into a ruling and a serving caste.

Weege points out the "utterly un-Greek heads" on Etruscan paintings and that their race and culture indicates Asiatic origin. In his remarkable work he offers a rich illustrative material for the study of racial types.³⁷ That the vast majority of the populations in the Alpine countries is of non-Indogermanic derivation seems beyond all doubt. Especially in the Tirol, as A. Deutschmann³⁸ shows, Teutonic colonization was comparatively thin, so that the pre-Teutonic element was by no means displaced. Also certain linguistic peculiarities in the Alpine dwellers and in the South German populations in general seem to point toward Etruscan influences.³⁹ The German Swiss say "Khas" for cheese instead of the German equivalent "Käse", which perhaps is an Etruscan-Asiatic heritage, as also the German fashion of putting the stress upon the first syllable.

THE IBERIANS

Another widely spread non-Aryan race were the Iberians, whose speech continues to live in the Basque language spoken by some 900,000 people in the North of Spain and South of France, which bears no relation to any other living European tongue. The Iberian language was once heard all over Spain, the South of France, Sicily, Lower Italy, Britain, Ireland (Hibernia-Iberia), and Scotland,⁴⁰ as is evidenced by phonetic similarities between the Basque and South French dialects, inscriptions, place names, and many common usages.⁴¹ Also classical historians support this view. Some single branches of the Iberians, for example, the Turdetanians, had attained a very high level of civilization.

Iberian tribes probably once also lived in Italy, in the Alps, and in the Danubian countries. W. von Humboldt connects the Carpi, after whom the Carpathian Mountains were called, with the Iberian tribe of the Carpetanians. The name of a Rhætian tribe, of the Berunensi who once were renowned for their lead mining, is probably related to the Basque word "beruna", which means lead. Wirth derives Vosges (mountains) from the Basques (or Vasques). Iberian tribes are also traceable in the Caucasian Mountains, and the opinion has even been advanced in recent times that these Caucasian Iberians must have been the forefathers of the West European ones, a surmise which does not seem improbable in view of the circumstance that comparative philology tries to trace relationships between the Basque and the Caucasian tongues, and that also the comparison between place names and names of peoples seems to point in this direction.

FINNS AND MAGYARS

Among the non-Indogermanic languages in Europe it was the Finnic and its relatives that principally obtained. These languages belong to that widely spread Ural-Altaic family which comprises the Finns, Lapps, Esths, Livs, Magyars, Turks, Samoyeds, Ostiaks, Mongols, Japanese and so forth. The centre of dispersion of the Finnic people to-day is Finland, but also in Scandinavia, whose very name is derived from a Finnic root,⁴² there still live some Finns. Finns are to be found all around the Baltic shores, as far down as the German frontier, and finally also in vast parts of Russia where Herodotus first found them. In ancient times they presumably even extended farther south-west, as some single linguistic traces in the Alpine countries seem to betray.

In their home country, Finland, the Finns have developed an extraordinarily high culture, in no respect inferior to that of even the most advanced branch of the Indogermanic family, in some respects it is greatly superior to the cultural standard of most of the European "Aryans". That the Magyars except their race politicians are a cultured nation no one will venture to contest. Altogether in present-day Europe there live about 23-millions of people belonging to the Ural-Altaic language family. The Bulgarians, too, are a Finnic tribe, despite their Slav speech, and also the Roumanians have an appreciable strain of Finnic blood in their veins, while on their part the Finns and Magyars have undergone strong Nordic or Indogermanic racial influences.

NON-ARYAN FEATURES IN EUROPE

From the evidence of the vast anthropological and prehistoric material collected in recent times the inference seems warranted that non-Nordic tribes immigrating from Asia during the late Stone Age dispersed over vast parts of Europe carrying with them from their original homes their domestic animals and cultural implements. This assumption is supported by legendary traditions, by the classical historians, as also by folklore, inscriptions, place names, etc. The much-read German explorer, A. Wirth, summarizes his observations in the following words: "The non-Aryan origin of the majority of the Europeans must be admitted as proved and recognized by scientists."⁴³ He put forth a hypothesis according to which the historically ascertained non-Aryan tribes of South and Central Europe, namely the Pelasgi, Etruscans, Iberians, Ligurians, and also the Berbers of North Africa, the Hittites of Anterior Asia, the Circassians of the Caucasus and some others, were all members of one and the same racial family which he calls the "Kas Rasse". This race, during a long period of migrations, commencing, it may be, several thousand years previous to the first appearance of the Indogermans, poured forth from the Caucasus, and dispersed over the whole of Anterior Asia, the Mediterranean countries, and Central Europe. In support of this thesis Wirth adduces a vast material.

According to this theory it is not surprising that there are striking similarities between place names of regions most distant from each other. The Kas peoples, according to Wirth, formed the connecting link. From Hindu Kush to Gibraltar the place names are all of the same. The Eneti occur in Asia Minor, but as Veneti

they crop up also in Italy and in the Alps. The Lake of Constance was called *Lacus Venetus*. *Mons Venetus* lies in the Pyrenees. The Tauern range in the Austrian Alps may be connected with a Mount Tabor in Palestine, with Tabriz, Taurus, etc. (perhaps also with the Slav-Turkish word "Tabor" = stronghold). Especially in the Alps, geographical names often seem to point toward Asia, e.g. Carinthia, Carniola, Tyrol, Styria, Lech, Tegernsee, Enns, Gastein, Möll, Sill, Rhein, Brixen, Bregenz, and numerous others. A widely spread root frequently recurring in river names probably signifying "flowing" is the syllable "dan". It is contained for instance in the river names Danubius, Rhodanus (Rhône), Eridanus, (Po), Danaster (Dniester), Danaprus (Dniepr), Don, Duna, and Jordan. Rivers of the name Jardanos occur in Crete, Elis, and Lydia; in the Caucasus we find the Ardon river, and in north-east Siberia the rivers Aldan, Korkodon, Uliandina and Lawdon. The root word dan is also contained in the name Engadin. In the language of the Georgians, a Caucasian tribe, the root word "din" means "to flow".⁴⁴ These are but a few examples. Wirth provides a whole host of them.

Non-Aryan influences are also traceable in the North of Europe.⁴⁵ In the Scandinavian and Frisian languages the article is put after the substantive, as it is in the Finnic and Basque languages. The Thunderer Thor of Teutonic mythology reminds one of the Finnic thunder bird Turul, which was also the totem of Attila. The word "deutsch" (= German) comes from "Theudiscus" and the Gothic root "thiod"—in old German "diet" (= common people), in Latvian "tauta", in Breton "teut". In the Lapp language "teudo" means man. Therefore it may be that the term "deutsch" comes from a word originally applied to the subdued non-Germanic masses. The social ranks of the old Teutonic peoples seem to have had origin in racial differences, as may be inferred from the Eddaic description of the physical types of the nobles, yeomen, and serfs who worshipped different gods.

From a critical study of the anomalies of the Teutonic languages as contrasted with the common Indogermanic linguistic features, especially as regards the shifting of consonants and accents, as also the decay of the inflexional forms, Feist arrives at the conclusion that modifications of the Teutonic languages must have taken place owing to strong non-Aryan influences. It is most remarkable that the shifting of consonants coincides roughly speaking with the location of the Alpine race on the map of Europe and that it displays its greatest intensity in the centre of dispersion of this race.

A very considerable portion of the Teutonic vocabulary admits no explanation from Indogermanic roots. Feist estimates these alien elements at about one-third of the entire stock of Teutonic root words, and he concludes from these and other reasons that the Teutons originally were non-Aryans who in the course of time lost their vernacular speech and adopted a foreign tongue, which in their mouths underwent many essential transformations.⁴⁶ The name "German", be it observed by the way, repeatedly turns up on Celtic, Iberian, and Western Asiatic ground. Similarly Hommel likened the Burgundians to the Berekynds, who in the thirteenth century B.C. invaded Asia Minor.

In addition other authorities, Penka, Nörrenberg, F. Kauffmann, Hirt, K. Wessely among them, have emphasized⁴⁷ that alien influences, namely Etruscan, Rhætian, Finnic, and Celtic elements, must be made responsible for the repeated shifting of consonants the Teutonic languages underwent in the course of their evolution. Verner's Law on certain transformations in the Germanic languages can only be explained by a comparison with the Finnic. It coincides strikingly with Setälä's Law in the Finnic language. Many interconnexions in other respects between Teutons and Finns are traceable. This is the result arrived at also by Friedrich Braun,⁴⁸ who continued Nikolaus Marr's researches on the Caucasian or as he calls them, the "Japhetic" languages. We are told, for example, that the imperfect of the weak verb (ending in *te*) which except in the Teutonic is found in no other Indogermanic language, is derived from the Japhetic, or that the ancient name of the Black Forest, Abnoba, is explained by the Japhetic *abna* = wood and the plural ending *ba*; nay, more, that the very name of the mythical progenitor of the Teutonic race, mentioned by Tacitus as "the earth-born god Tuisto" in the Japhetic language is equivalent to "Son of the Earth". Braun following up Feist's hypothesis of the non-Aryan origin of the Teutons believes that they were probably Indogermanized, by a pre-Celtic wave, whereby the Indogermanic speech suffered manifold modifications. But even assuming Feist's theory, it seems to me that there remains the open question why in their physical characteristics the Teutons are so little like the Caucasian tribes; unless we assume these to have undergone a thorough physical transformation, too.

Scientific research along the most different lines has arrived at the same end, namely, that the actual population of Europe is the result of some thousand years of migrations and crossings of races. These constant ebbings and flowings of ethnic waves

were not restricted to prehistoric times. In the fourth and fifth centuries of our era the Huns dominated large parts of Europe up to the Baltic Sea ; most of the Teutonic tribes, the Ostrogoths, Gepids, Quads, Marcomanni, Suevi, Thuringians, Ripuarian Franks, were conquered and forced to pay tribute and go to war for their overlords. The Visigoths took refuge before them on Roman territory. Byzantium also paid tribute, and even Pope Leo appeared before Attila imploring mercy for Rome. After the death of Attila his sons began to quarrel among themselves and the Huns were driven back to the East. Then came the Avars, also an Ural-Altaic tribe, whom historical sources identify with the Huns. Their rule extended over Lower Austria, Styria, Carinthia, as far as the Pustertal in Tyrol, at times even up to Middle and North Germany, hordes of Avars settled in Upper Franconia where their physical traits are still said to be recognizable in the population (Wirth). Only Charlemagne succeeded in overcoming their power. The Avars were succeeded by the Slavs who took possession of the deserted land not as invaders, but as peaceful settlers, partly under Avar sovereignty. For a brief time many Slavs were even politically united under one great empire. Slavs settled not only throughout the greatest part of North Germany (Holstein, Oldenburg, Mecklenburg, Rügen, Pomerania, the Marches, and part of Hanover), but also in Central Germany (Saxony, Lusatia, Upper Franconia). The territory south of Bayreuth was for a long time called " Slavonia ". The names Berlin, Schwerin, Stettin, Brandenburg, Leipzig, Nürnberg, Bamberg, are derived from Slav roots.⁴⁹ Slavs also colonized the Austrian Alpine countries up to East Tyrol and Salzburg, as is evidenced by many place names (e.g. Graz). That the Slavs are strongly crossed with non-Aryan elements can easily be proved ⁵⁰; on the other hand, the Czech people have a full measure of German racial strains as is shown for instance by the fact that in Czech as in German the stress is laid on the first syllable.

In the tenth century the Magyars invaded Europe, raiding Germany, Italy, France, for more than fifty years, until finally they suffered a decisive defeat in the terrible battle on the Lechfeld near Augsburg. Then, in the thirteenth century, the Mongol hurricane swept over Europe ; the army of the German knights under Duke Henry the Pious, who opposed them near Liegnitz, was nearly crushed by the overpowering numbers of the enemy ; but the Mongols also had suffered such dreadful losses that they flooded back from Germany. In Russia, however, they ruled some

250 years (until 1480); numerous Russian aristocratic families are of Mongol and Tartar origin.⁵¹ Finally, as was the case with the Huns, their might crumbled away owing to internal quarrels.

In passing mention may be made here of the Arabs, whom Charles Martell beat back at Poitiers (732). In Spain they ruled some eight hundred years (711-1492). In the Turkish wars, lasting from the fifteenth to the eighteenth century, Vienna was twice besieged by the Turks, and only Prince Eugene of Savoy drove them for all time from Hungary.

This many thousand years' struggle between the East and the West could not fail to effect at the same time extensive racial crossings. The last immigrants from the East were the Gipsies, who dispersed all over Europe. Finally mention must be made of the Jewish strain of blood which since the early Middle Ages has infiltrated all European nations by voluntary and compulsory conversion.

The fact that Europe, despite all the ethnic storms that swept over her from Asia, preserved Indogermanic speech, must surely be valued as a proof of racial vigour. In the first place, however, it was not the physical superiority of the Indogermans which effected the victory. That Europe was preserved from becoming Hunnic or Mongolic is due to Roman civilization, whose mighty structure, although in its decadence, held back the waves of wild horsemen. Attila could overthrow the Teutons; but the Roman general Aetius, under whose command, it is true, were also Teutons, was yet strong enough to resist him, though only at the price of enormous sacrifices. For the administration of his empire, however, Attila was thrown back upon the Roman officials. Upon the death of Attila the Hunnic might collapsed; Rome lives to this very day in the great organizations of State and Church, and in our civilization.⁵²

This Roman civilization, in any case, is by no means a purely Indogermanic creation. Its roots everywhere reach deeply down into the pre-Aryan cultures of the Mediterranean peoples and of the ancient Orient; later it was most strongly influenced by the Hellenes whose pre-Aryan cultural foundations have been discussed in the foregoing chapter. Christianity then brought new "light from the East", the sacred books of Israel became the foundation of all subsequent moral cultures. In the time of the Crusades again the superior civilization of the Orient was fecundating the Occident. In the Arabian states of Spain a wonderful blossoming of culture developed as early as the ninth and tenth centuries,

such as for hundreds of years remained without a parallel in the Christian countries of Europe.⁵³ Also the contributions of the Jews in modern cultural development are doubtlessly very great,⁵⁴ and in recent times the Japanese began to enrich science, after having previously influenced our artistic sense. Thus it no longer sounds paradoxical when Wirth puts the question as to whether the culture of the world, as it is to-day, has sprung more from Aryan or non-Aryan sources. An exact answer, it is true, cannot be given, for the "Aryans" of to-day are an amalgamation of many races.

GENIUS AND RACE

Yet race theorists do not throw up the game. They fairly own that Europe to-day is a variegated confusion of races; but claim all elements of any value for cultural development to have come from Teutonic or Aryan sources, and this not only in the Teutonic but also in the Romance countries. Ludwig Woltmann,⁵⁵ to make good this thesis has devoted an enormous amount of work in examining pictures of the geniuses of all countries, chiefly, however, of France and Italy, seeking to detect in them the characteristic features of the Teutonic race. His book certainly seems to prove a considerable Nordic admixture in those peoples. True, the coincidence of all Teutonic racial traits in one and the same individual is but seldom found; therefore the cases enumerated by Woltmann could at best be "mongrels" and he could not avoid admitting this, when he qualifies as cross-breeds between the Teutonic and Mediterranean brunet types, for instance, Luther, Goethe, Beethoven, Michelangelo, Raphael, Dante, Shakespeare. How is this consistent with his assertion that the *entire* European civilization, in the Slav and Romance countries, also, is the work of the Teutonic race (p. 293)? The answer he gives is bewildering: "Dante, Raphael, Luther, etc., are geniuses, not because of their being cross-breeds, but in spite of this. Their genius is the heritage of the Teutonic race!" Previously (p. 113) Woltmann maintained that the Teutonic race through crossings with brunet types had suffered a decided physical deterioration, and that this signifies also a mental debasement. One can hardly imagine what glorious cultural heights humanity might have attained if Nature in creating her master spirits had taken advice from the race faddists!

A detailed criticism of what Woltmann says cannot be given here. For the support of his thesis he adduces much material

which, however, ought to be examined with the utmost distrust. He, for instance, declares every man of genius to be a Teuton, whose name only sounds Teutonic. He himself, however, repeatedly points out that the owners of Teutonic names cannot always be considered as Teutons, for such names were frequently adopted by the conquered. Are all our contemporaries who have Biblical names Semites; and those who have received Teutonic ones, Teutons? Also his inferences from portraits seem little reliable. Thus he says of Petrarch, "his eyes are painted in that clear, yellowish-grey colour by which the old painters used to render blue eyes." Everybody else would simply conclude that Petrarch had yellowish-grey eyes. Woltmann, however, knows that Italian painters used this tinge to render blue eyes. Very likely blue paint was not yet invented at that time. If, despite all, he fails to detect decisive Teutonic characteristics in the pictures examined, then at last he attributes to them "tall stature", "pleasant eyes", "blue spots in the iris", "beautiful hair", "the facial traits of the Teutonic race", or a "pale" or a "rosy" complexion, sufficient in Woltmann's eyes as an evidence for Teutonic extraction or at least a Teutonic strain of blood. Ariosto, for instance, had black hair and eyes and a dark face. Woltmann, however, consoles himself with the statement that the other parts of his body were extremely white, a peculiarity which evidently is only found with Teutons. Michelangelo, Dante, and many others were also dark. Even Gobineau had, as Woltmann himself stated, brown hair and eyes.

The universal expansion of the Roman Church and also the French Revolution are lauded as emanations of Teutonic grandeur, while Chamberlain on the ground of the very same race hypothesis, holds them to be the offsprings of anti-Aryan tendencies. The Renaissance, apotheosized by Woltmann as a flower of Teutonic genius, is in the eyes of Gobineau, who was a stout Catholic, the quintessence of rank sensuality, and therefore an emanation of an anti-Teutonic racial spirit.⁵⁶

The truth is that the outward appearance of great men not unfrequently clashes fatally with our common notion of the Teutonic racial type. Take for example Chamberlain's lofty description of the Teutonic type: "Large, beaming celestial eyes, golden hair, gigantic stature, harmony of musculature, an elongated skull which by the ceaselessly pulsating passion-tortured brain is driven forward out of the circular line of animal ease, the oval face expressive of an exalted soul-life."

However, it does not seem that geniuses as a rule come up to this standard. Above all their crania in most cases approached the "circular line of animal ease", as Chamberlain so nicely puts it. Bismarck, Luther, Laplace, Napoleon, Pascal, Raphael, Beethoven, Haydn, Schubert, are a few examples of round-headedness among men of genius; nay, more, it even seems that hyperbrachycephaly, the extreme form of round-headedness assumed to begin at index 85, is found frequently among them. The skull of Schiller with the index 84, comes close upon it, Kant's index was 88.5, that is to say, he was distinctly hyperbrachycephalic, Hamerling's was 85.3, Schopenhauer 86, Leibnitz even 99.3.⁵⁷ Isn't it a pity? What might these people have been able to achieve had they but been long-skulled! Chamberlain's "giant-stature" does not fit in any better. A strikingly large number of geniuses have been under middle-size, so that some authorities even came to consider shortness of stature as characteristic in men of genius.⁵⁸

The pigmentation of the hair, eyes, and skin also in many geniuses was dark, as Woltmann himself amply proves in his works. Lombroso even advanced the opinion that genius and dark pigmentation are coincident. On Goethe and Beethoven, for example, we possess studies which take very carefully into account all contemporaneous evidences.⁵⁹ Goethe had black hair, brown eyes, yellowish in later life, a distinctly dark complexion, oblique yellow teeth, and a slightly crooked nose, which even excited the suspicion of some modern anti-Semites. He was not particularly tall, but seemed so owing to his upright bearing. Beethoven was short and corpulent; he had coal-black hair, dark eyes and skin. His face was quite ugly, with strong protruding jaws (prognathy), receding forehead and flat, thick nose. One may easily trace in Beethoven's face slightly negroid traits. His skull was very large. Luschan found in his cranium very primitive, Neanderthaloid characteristics, and advanced the opinion that musical talents might be a sort of atavism. Goethe as well as Beethoven may be taken as belonging to the Alpine racial type⁶⁰; but as these two "non-Aryans" cannot be said to have been devoid of any influence on European cultural development, Woltmann's thesis of the exclusively Teutonic creation of this culture seems daring.

Extant statistical material on the connexion between racial characteristics and giftedness does not seem to corroborate the assumptions of the race theorists. Thus Schliz⁶¹ found in dark, long-headed school children an apparent superiority of giftedness,

then follow in order the round-heads with mixed pigmentation, the blond long-heads, the brunet round-heads, and finally the blond round-heads. Similarly, according to a census taken by Matiegka⁶² in Bohemia, the "pure" types, especially the blond Teutonic types, seem to be less gifted than the mixed ones. The same results appear also from a series of other statistics. Woltmann is at no loss for an explanation.⁶³ No wonder, he says, that at school dark children get better marks than the blond long-heads, as appears from the examinations of Muffang, Ammon, Röse, and others, for at school application and precocity carry the day, and not innate giftedness. But what hymns of triumph on the genius of the Teutonic race Woltmann would have sung had the statistics turned out to be in favour of the blonds?

• NOTES TO CHAPTER V

*¹ C. M. Hoernes, *Natur- und Urgeschichte des Menschen*, 1909; L. Reinhardt, *Der Mensch zur Eiszeit in Europa*, 1913; K. Classen, *Die Völker Europas zur jüngeren Steinzeit*, 1912. The most recent state of science is given by E. Pittard, *Les races et l'histoire*, 1924.

² Cf. P. Hambruch, "Der Schadel von Broken Hill," *AA*, 1922.

³ Hoernes, pp. 254, 322; Reinhardt pp. 259, 267, 336. Classen, pp. 8, 43.

⁴ This has been maintained by Kollmann and opposed by Schwalbe. Cf. also Jens Paulsen, *AA*, 1923, who is for Kollmann and Zelizko in *Sitzungsberichte der anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien*, 1922, p. 22.

⁵ Cf. their last statements on the archæological congress at Christiania, *ZE*, 1919, p. 24.

⁶ Though Schliz in *AA*, 1908, has tried this. Cf. Sophus Müller, *Urgeschichte Europas*, 1905; V. Hehn, *Kulturpflanzen und Haustiere*, etc., 8th ed., 1912; M. Much, *Heimat der Indogermanen*, 1904; Hoernes, i, pp. 404, 545; ii, p. 186; Hirt, *Indogermanen*, 2 vols., 1905-7; Schuchardt, *Alteuropa in seiner Kultur- und Sittenentwicklung*, 1919.

⁷ Cf. W. Ripley, *The Races of Europe*, 1900 (extensive bibliography); J. Deniker, *Les races et les peuples de la terre*, 1900, and "Les Six Races composant la Population actuelle de l'Europe," in *JAI*, 1904; Hans Guenther, *Rassenkunde des deutschen Volkes*, 1922. The best recent book is that by Pittard already quoted.

⁸ Cf. H. J. Fleure, "Some Early Neanthropic types in Europe and their Modern Representations," *JAI*, 1920, p. 12. *The Races of England and Wales*, 1923, and his other studies. The professor of Celtic philology, J. Pokorny, believes that this race comes from the Eskimos, who are Mongoloids though long-skulled.

⁹ *Internationales Zentralblatt für Anthropologie*, viii, 1903, p. 154.

¹⁰ Zbinden in *AA*, 1911, p. 280; cf. also Toldt, in *MWAG*, 1911, and Frizzi, *MWAG*, 1910.

¹¹ Cf. F. G. Parsons, "Anthropological Observations on German Prisoners of War," *JAI*, 1919, p. 20.

¹² In France in the same grave are frequently found skeletons of German (Frank) males together with females of a small growth, which Lapouge considers belong to a special race (*homo contractus*). Lapouge in *Race et Milieu Social*, 1909, p. 46.

¹³ In Italy the pure blond type is 3 per cent, the mixed blond 9.3 per cent of the population; in Venetia where there are the most, it is 5.4 per cent, and in some places 14.2 per cent. Giuffrida-Ruggeri, "Anthropology of Italy," *JAI*, 1918, p. 80.

¹⁴ Harold Peaks, "Racial Elements concerned in the first siege of Troy," *JAI*, 1916, p. 154; Luschan, *Völker, Rassen, Sprachen*, p. 130. According to Pittard, p. 364, the majority of the old Greek skulls are long, only 11 per cent being round.

¹⁵ Drogones Laertius, iii, 5.

¹⁶ Cf. M. Hoernes, *Natur- und Urgeschichte des Menschen*, 1909, vol. i, p. 355, where further material is to be found.

¹⁷ Cf. W. E. Gladstone, *On Colours in Homer* (German edition, 1878). He opines that "xanthos" is equivalent to chestnut-brown, red-brown, brown-red. E. Veckenstedt, *Geschichte der griechischen Farbenlehre*, 1888, designates this as reddish-yellow. Æschylus shows Elektra recognizing that Orestes has been to his father's grave from a lock of hair he has laid there and a footprint. From this Professor Ridgway cleverly deduces that those of royal birth were distinguished from ordinary mortals by having blond hair and being very tall. But then only a small stratum could have been meant, for Elektra says (verse 192) that the lock of hair could have been from the head of no other man.

¹⁸ Philologists as a rule call this brilliant-eyed; this is confirmed by the ancient scholion to Apollonius Rhodios, i, 1280. Schliemann preferred owl-eyed; Veckenstedt blue-eyed.

¹⁹ Cf. Athenæus, xiii, 81 (in Lefebure de Villebrun's edition, vol v, p. 152).

²⁰ Cf. i.e. R. Kekule v Stradonitz, *Die griechische Skulptur*, 3rd ed., 1922, pp. 12, 29, 51, 222. The dyed hair is given as brownish-red. Cf. Emil Waldmann, *Griechische Originale*, 1923, pp. 70 et seq. It would be worth consideration as to whether red hair had not some other meaning. Many primitive peoples dye their hair red or yellowish-red; the Somali, Dinka, Bakari, Carabs, Otomakes, Tasmanians, Melanesians, some Arabs. Cf. O. Stoll, *Das Geschlechtsleben in der Völkerpsychologie*, 1908, pp. 350 seq. The old Germans and Gauls, and in later days Roman women also, dyed their hair red. Cf. Feist, p. 245; Diodorus, v, 28; Tacitus, *Hist.*, iv, 61. Many prehistoric skulls show to-day signs of the hair having been dyed red or ochre-colour. Red was the symbol of strength. The blond Thracians dyed their hair blue. Aristotle in his *Problemata*, xiv, 14, 2, gives a remarkable explanation of the light pigmentation of the northern peoples.

²¹ Cf. the title-page in Martin Schede's *Die Burg von Athen*, 1922.

²² Cf. *Ausgewählte griechische Terrakotten*, published by the General Administration of the Royal Museum in Berlin, 1903, pp. 5, 6 et seq.

²³ Cf. M. Collignon, *Geschichte d. griech. Plastik*, i, 1897; *Das Titelbild, den Zeuskopf v. Olympia* (p. 343); *Ueber orientalische Einflüsse auf die griech. Kunst*, pp. 68, 156, 377; A. Springer, *Hdbch. d. Kunstgeschichte*, 1923, i, pp. 52 seq., 188 seq.; K. Woerman, *Gesch. d. Kunst*, 1922, i, p. 209 seq.

²⁴ Cf. the fundamental works H. Hirt, *Die Indogermanen*, 1905-7, vol. ii, and S. Feist, *Kultur, Ausbreitung und Herkunft der Indogermanen*, 1913.

²⁵ Further proofs are given by G. Grote, *History of Greece*, German edition, i, pp. 505, 523; cf. Kiesling, "Das ethnische Problem des antiken Griechenlands," *ZE.*, 1905, p. 1009.

²⁶ Cf. Herodotus, i, 56 to 58. Herodotus says that the Hellenes before mixing with the Pelasgi were quite unimportant, and only by this became a numerous people. He emphasizes that the Ionians and particularly the Athenians were to a large extent of non-Hellenic race, and gives several proofs. Cf. i, 146; ii, 50, 51; iv, 145; v, 66, 88; vii, 94, 95; viii, 135, etc.

²⁷ Curtius, *Griechische Geschichte*, i, 1, p. 40. Beloch opposes the theory of Oriental influences, H. Wirth, *Homer and Babylon*, maintains it on important evidence.

²⁸ Lichtenberg, *Die aigäische Kultur*, 1918, tries to prove that the Cretans were Aryans, who helped in a large degree to bring about the blossoming of Egyptian culture. K. Woermann, *Geschichte der Kunst*, 2nd edition, 1912, vol. i, p. 189, says of Lichtenberg's theories that "these are opinions which are not accepted by distinguished researchers".

²⁹ Cf. Strabo, vii, 1, § 3; Plutarch, *Marius*, 19. With regard to the Ligurians see besides Hirt and Feist, Classen, p. 13 seq., and Mullenhoff, *Deutsche Altertumskunde*, 1890-6, vol. iii, pp. 173-93.

³⁰ Wilsen and Woltmann naturally consider them Aryans, but Hirt says: "To-day hardly a single researcher would consider this language to be of Indogermanic origin." In Pauly-Wissowa's *Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* (revised edition), vol. vi, p. 773, Skutsch says: "The question as to whether the Etruscans were of Indogermanic origin may be considered settled. One still only meets with complete dilettants on the abandoned road." In the *Real-Encyclopädie* are further data concerning the Etruscans, cf. also P. O. Schjott, *Die Herkunft der Etrusker* (Christiania), 1910, who considers them to have been Pelasgi. He takes them to have been the creators of the entire Roman culture and the carriers of the ancient culture of the countries of the Euphrates.

³¹ It has been often pointed out that Tuscany also in more modern times has produced particularly much talent.

³² Cf. Wilhelm Schulze, *Zur Geschichte der lateinischen Eigennamen*, p. 581.

³³ Cf. also Pliny, *Natural History*, iii, 24, in which many Rhetian peoples are detailed.

³⁴ Cf. Ludwig Steub, *Rathische Ethnologie*, 1854; *Zur Ethnologie der deutschen Alpen*, 1887; also Fr. Stolz in his *Beiträge zur Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte von Tirol*, 1894.

³⁵ Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte*, i, p. 120.

³⁶ Cf. Sergi, "Die Etrusker und die alten Schädel des etruskischen Gebietes," in *AA.*, 1914, p. 309.

³⁷ Cf. Fritz Weege, *Etruskische Malerei*, with 89 text pictures and 101 plates, 1921, especially pp. 57-67.

³⁸ Deutschmann, *Zur Entstehung des deutsch-österreichischen Bauernstammes*, 1913.

³⁹ See Hirt, i, pp. 21, 57; Feist, pp. 373 seq.

⁴⁰ Rhys considers the Pict inscriptions in Scotland to be Iberian.

⁴¹ Cf. Gerland in Groeber's *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*, 1888, vol. i, pp. 313 seq., and Schuchardt in *MWAG.*, 1915, p. 107. There is ample material in Hirt, i, p. 34, Classen, *a.a.O.*, p. 11 seq., and A. Wirth, p. 100 seq.

⁴² Mullenhoff, vol. ii, pp. 39 et seq.; cf. F. N. Finck, *Sprachstämme des Erdkreises*, 1915, p. 59.

⁴³ A. Wirth, *Der Gang der Weltgeschichte*, 1913, p. 95; cf. further his *Rasse und Volk*, 1914.

⁴⁴ Perhaps the name Poseidon has some connexion with this. In the time of the Pelasgi this god had power, according to myths, over the inland seas, and Herodotus clearly states the foreign origin of this god. However, "danu" is quoted by Feist, p. 524, as being Avestian and meaning river. Is this Indogermanic or borrowed?

⁴⁵ The following is according to Wirth, *Gang der Weltgeschichte*, p. 256 seq.; also *Rasse und Volk*, p. 250.

⁴⁶ See Feist's latest work, *Indogermanen und Germanen*, 1914.

⁴⁷ Cf. Karl Wessely, "Zur germanischen Lautverschiebung," *Anth*, xii, p. 540.

⁴⁸ Friedrich Braun, *Die Urbevölkerung Europas und die Herkunft der Germanen*, 1922.

⁴⁹ Cf. R. Kleinpaul, *Die Ortsnamen im Deutschen*, 1912, pp. 15, 102.

⁵⁰ The distinguished historian and Conservative publicist Hans Delbrück in his *Regierung und Volkskunde*, 1914, p. 3, says: "There can be no doubt that only a small number of present day German people . . . are in the main Germans." A Wirth estimates the German part of the population at one-tenth. But this seems to me to be far too low. The Nordic element forms certainly a great part of the German population. It must also be noticed that the old Slavs seem to have been Nordic to a large extent, and that in some districts Teutons have been Slavized and later on re-Germanized.

⁵¹ Cf. Schieman, *Russland, Polen, und Liefland*, 1886, vol. i, p. 255.

⁵² Where Roman culture did not shine forth any more, or only in a lesser degree, the Aryans succumbed to the onsets coming from Asia, just as in Russia, which only at a later date adopted European culture.

⁵³ Schack, *Poesie und Kunst der Araber in Spanien und Sizilien*, 1877, 2 volumes.

⁵⁴ See the small book by the famous botanist and culture historian M. Schleiden, *Die Bedeutung der Juden für die Erhaltung und Wiederbelebung der Wissenschaften im Mittelalter*, 1887; for more recent information, *Der Juden Anteil am Fortschritt der Kultur*, published by the Verein zur Abwehr des Antisemitismus, Berlin, and Professor Julius Goldstein, *Das deutsche Geistesleben und die Juden* (a lecture delivered in 1914). Further material on this subject may be found in many of the publications of the Philo-Verlag, 13 Lindenstrasse, Berlin, S W. 68.

⁵⁵ Cf. Woltmann, *Politische Anthropologie*, 1913, pp. 112 and 255; also his later writings, *Die Germanen und die Renaissance in Italien*, 1905, *Die Germanen in Frankreich*, 1907. Cf. Albrecht Wirth, *Rasse und Volk*, 1914, pp. 105, 121, who rejects Woltmann's physiognomical diagnosis entirely.

⁵⁶ French writers, on the contrary, maintain that the high cultural development in France and Italy is exactly due to the fact that the peoples of these countries have but a small strain of Teutonic blood in their veins. Cf. H. Taine, *Philosophy of Art*, German edition, 1902, vol. i, p. 121. As a point of fact, the Germanic immigration seems to have been numerically small. Cf. Dahn, *Urgeschichte*, vol. i, pp. 239, 242, 260-1, 282-4, 289, 290; vol. iv, p. 299. Fustel de Coulanges, *Histoire des Institutions politiques de l'ancienne France*, 1877, vol. i, p. 470 et seq. Ripley, *Races of Europe*, 1900, p. 254. Historians

of the Middle Ages point out that the Teutons could not stand the Italian climate and so soon dwindled away. Wars and feuds decreased the Germanic nobility. Cf. Prutz, *Staatengeschichte des Abendlandes*, ii, pp. 209, 234. Yet the materials collected by Woltmann and others seem to indicate that the Nordic element in France is still considerable. D'Auriac, *La Nationalité Française*, 1913, ascribes many evils to the Germanic blood in France; obviously influenced by his nationalism.

⁵⁷ The figures are taken from different investigations published in the *Archives for Anthropology*, etc. On Leibniz cf. *Verhandlungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnographie und Urgeschichte*, 1902, pp. 471 seq. Professor Krause deduces that "the skull was small and round and was certainly not of the old Germanic type". Leibnitz according to his own statement was of Polish descent. His forefathers wrote their name Leubnicz or Lubenicz. Leibnitz also had dark hair. For Chamberlain Leibnitz is naturally "a true German thinker".

⁵⁸ Buschan gives numerous proofs of this in his *Menschenkunde*, 1909, p. 59.

⁵⁹ Fritz Stahl, *Wie sah Goethe aus?* 1905; Theodor Frimmel, *Beethoven's äussere Erscheinung*, 1905.

⁶⁰ Wirth, *Rasse und Volk*, 1914, p. 105, says "Almost all anthropologists hold Goethe for a non-Teuton, most of them consider him an Alpine."

⁶¹ *AA.*, 1901, p. 191 et seq.

⁶² *MWAG.*, 1898, pp. 122 seq.; cf. also Buschan, *a.a.O.*, p. 116.

⁶³ Woltmann, *Germanen in Frankreich*, p. 13.

CHAPTER VI

THE PROBLEM OF RACE MIXING

EFFECTS OF RACIAL CROSSINGS

THE advocates of race privileges very often have advanced the legend that cross-breedings are sterile and inferior in type ; and this has been accepted in good faith and repeated by many a learned professor.¹ Already, 442 B.C. when the tribune Caius Canuleius demanded that in Rome marriages between patricians and plebians should be permitted this was denounced by the aristocracy as an attempt to contaminate their blood and to introduce sexual promiscuousness in the manner of wild beasts ; nobody would then know to which race he belonged, and a mongrel could not even be in concord with himself (" ne secum quidem ipse concors," Livy, iv, 2).

Many of the States of America have passed laws against marriages between white and coloured people, implying by " coloured " all those who have in their veins even the smallest strain of black, yellow, or red admixture. Baron Fircks, a Prussian Government statistician, attempted to prove that marriages between Christians and Jews are less prolific. This assertion has been refuted by Boeckh,² one of the leading German scientific statisticians, who proved that Fircks had made a methodical error in his calculations and demonstrated that rather the opposite was true. The well-known Norwegian race biologist Mjöen³ considers as harmonious even crosses between Teutons and Hottentots, while on the other hand he entirely rejects unions between Norwegians and Lapps. To uphold this, he can put forward but one single detailed case, which, of course, does not prove anything. Nietzsche ascribed moral disintegration to the mixing of races, though he scoffed at the usual race theories.

Two of the greatest anthropologists, Friedrich Ratzel and Felix von Luschan, have rejected decisively the legend of biological sterility and disharmony of racial crossings.⁴ True, many half-castes in some parts of the world reveal dire physical and moral depravity, but the causes are as a rule due to social environment.

In countries where defenceless coloured women fall an easy prey to European adventurers of the lowest kind, where coloured children are violated, infected, and ruined for life by white gold-diggers, sailors and others, and where, moreover, the half-caste is ostracized owing to the prejudices prevalent on both sides, and is deprived by his birth of every fair chance in life, we hardly can expect to find a numerous, healthy, morally, and intellectually well-developed offspring. Under more favourable conditions the number of highly gifted half-castes is not small; one of the greatest literary geniuses of the world, Pushkin, the founder of Russian national literature, had a Negro strain in his blood, as also the famous French writers, Dumas father and son. "Pushkin is the national poet of the Russians—there has never been in this world a more true poet than he," says Brückner, the leading German authority on Russian literature.⁵ Some others of the greatest Russian writers, Tolstoi, Dostoievski, Gorki among others, show in their facial traits distinct signs of a Mongolic admixture. The same holds good with Strindberg. The two Dumas's offer the rare example of literary renown attained by father and son.⁶ Dumas the elder, a mulatto, was one of the chief promoters of romanticism in French literature; it was he, above all, who through his historical dramas and novels awakened among the French people a love for the national past. The great Danish writer, Georg Brandes, praises his overflowing original talent, his gigantic temperament, his herculean gifts; and finds in him "the sensual fire of the black race".⁷ Dumas, the younger, according to Lanson, was a visionary moralist, whose aim and object was the reform of family life and the struggle against social disgregation. Some of his plays are true masterpieces of social depiction. The mulatto Booker Washington should also be mentioned here.

A close study of race mixings has been published by Professor Eugen Fischer, who is a leading German anthropologist and a strong believer in race.⁸ He studied in German South Africa the crossings between Boers and Hottentots, that is to say, the blend of two very distant racial elements, the Teutonic and the African. The main result of his exhaustive inquiry is the discovery that Mendel's law on heredity also applies to man. The product of race mixture is not a homogeneous amalgamation of the component races, but a loose blend where in the several individuals the most divers combinations of racial traits appear. The notion that the entire complex of the traits of a given race always reappears in the crossings, is erroneous; quite the contrary, the several traits

of each component race are transmitted quite independently of one another.

The often repeated assertion that race mixture results in degenerate, sterile, and intellectually and morally inferior products, has been utterly disproved by Fischer, whose anthropometric and statistical investigations demonstrated the contrary, namely, that the race mixtures examined on the whole were more robust, prolific, and healthy than either of the parent races ⁹ (p. 177). Also the assumption of intellectual and moral inferiority in the crossings as compared to the parent races is declared by Fischer as "quite erroneous" and "nonsensical" (pp. 166, 298). He even ascribes a multitude of fine qualities to the Rehoboth bastards, whom he calls good-natured, helpful, fair-minded, trustworthy, and dignified. Cases of theft and perfidiousness are as rare among them as adultery. Their family life is pure, and in regard to their sexual morals, this investigator even says "that the Europeans in this respect are unfortunately below these cross-breeds" (p. 268).

The only fault he finds with them is an utter lack of energy and a steady will. Without the continual driving and urging on the part of the Europeans, the bastard is unable to move forward. This lack of energy and initiative frequently degenerates into dull inertness, which to some extent may be set down to the climate, for the Boer, too, is to a certain degree more phlegmatic than the Dutch. But in some activities, for instance in the pursuit of cattle thieves and on marches, the bastard is of indefatigable endurance. What he is deficient in, is merely the active energy of the Europeans. This very observation, however, seems to indicate that it is not race properly speaking to which this inertness may be set down, For if it were a racial defect, it would indiscriminately appear in every respect. But it rather seems to be a mere social habit, inherent in a certain stage of development. These very same habits of inertness are reported by the ancient historians as a characteristic feature in the mode of life of the Teutons.

It is, however, most interesting and quite typical to see how Fischer in open contradiction to the results of his own careful observations, yet concludes in the end that, without a single exception, all European nations which have undergone the infiltration of inferior blood have had to pay for this sin by an appreciable decline in their intellectual and cultural standard. "Spain, Portugal, the whole of Latin America are warning examples; and also certain developments in the Roman Empire, in the Sicily of the Middle Ages, the India of to-day, and in North Africa may here be cited."

Fischer believes these examples so convincing that he disclaims energetically the crossing of races and is quite against treating half-castes on the same footing as whites. This conclusion indubitably clashes with the results gained by his personal study of living populations. The "striking facts" which moved him to this surprising conclusion, however, are borrowed from scientific provinces in which he evidently is not at all at home. That Spain, for instance, has deteriorated through racial crossings cannot be upheld by those conversant with Spanish history. The Moors certainly mixed with the Iberian, Roman, and Gothic inhabitants of Spain during the eight centuries of their domination. Yet during this period it is certain that Spain was greatly superior, culturally, to the rest of Europe; and the same may be claimed in respect to Moorish Sicily. After the downfall of the Moorish régime Spain again played a great part for two centuries, as a world power and a cultural centre, in spite of all previous race mixing. Quite on the contrary, responsibility for the subsequent decay of Spain rests to a vast extent upon the fanatical racial pride displayed by the Christian Spaniards. Fischer's opinions respecting the causes of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire are but the reflex of such poor speculations as Houston Stewart Chamberlain's *Foundations*.

In Brazil there lived several millions of Negro slaves, and cross-breeding began at a very early period because the Portuguese were less influenced by racial aversion than the Anglo-Saxons. Professor Dr. I. B. de Lacerda,¹⁰ a physician and director of the National Museum of Rio de Janeiro, finds that the mulattoes in Brazil on the whole are physically weaker and possess less power of endurance than their parent races, but in intelligence they are very often far superior to both Negroes and whites. Economically they lack efficiency, for they are extravagant, vainglorious, impractical, fickle, fanciful, and not very trustworthy. But none will deny to them a high intelligence, a literary and scientific giftedness and a conspicuous capacity for politics. The Brazilian mulatto race has already produced men of uncommon talents: poets, writers, painters, sculptors, orators, administrators, musicians, lawyers, physicians, and engineers, unsurpassed in professional skill and efficiency." Also distinguished statesmen—though sometimes unscrupulous in the choice of their means—have arisen from their ranks. Since the introduction of the republican form of government the mulattoes have been given access to the highest public offices. In the Parliament, in the Courts of Law, in the Universities, in diplomacy and administration, the mulattoes now hold high

positions and have a great influence on the government. In consequence of this fact, the prejudice against cross-breeding has given way ; but the mulattoes themselves have a propensity to take only white women for their wives, so that the younger generations gradually become fairer in complexion. Lacerda believes that this sexual selection in the course of a few generations will have effected the elimination of the Negro and mulatto elements in Brazil, an opinion, however, little consistent with modern theories on heredity.

THE RACIAL COMPOUND OF THE JEWS

A most remarkable instance of a racial compound is the Jews. This people offers special interest to the anthropologist, because their historical development and geographical distribution may be, and has been traced, minutely throughout the whole course of history. The common notion is that the Jews are a homogeneous race, and without further ado they are identified with the "Semites" and the well-known nasal curve is considered a peculiarly Semitic trait. Felix von Luschan, however, has shown ¹¹ that the one people generally accepted as the purest expression of the Semitic racial type, namely the Bedouins of the Arabian desert, are distinguished by small straight noses, thin lips, soft curly or wavy hair, and that the characteristic Jewish nose is due to a Hittite strain in the Jewish racial stock. It is known that the Hittites occupied a vast empire in Anterior Asia and their language was related to the Indogermanic. The Hittite nose is a common feature among the Armenians whose language also belonged to the Indogermanic family. Besides Semites and Hittites the Amorites, who probably were Aryans, formed a component part of the Jewish racial stock. The vulgar notion of the Indogermans and Semites being in radical contrast to one another is at any rate quite untenable. The close physical kinship of these two racial groups has, on the contrary, been established beyond dispute by anthropological research, and the more information we get on the prehistoric cultures of Western Asia, the more it becomes evident that numerous contacts and crossings must have taken place.

The Jews then, during the whole course of their history, always absorbed appreciable infiltrations of foreign blood, a fact which partly explains the variegations of types one meets among them, and also for their partial assimilation to the physical types of the nations they live among. Conversions to the Jewish religion of Greeks, Romans and other nationals occurred very frequently,

especially during the last two centuries B.C.; and in the Middle Ages and modern times, notwithstanding all obstacles, such conversions have happened occasionally, chiefly in the Slav countries, this being evidently the reason why the Polish and Russian Jews frequently bear unmistakable Slav facial characteristics.¹²

Fischberg, after an intense study of the racial features of the living generation of Jews, came to the conclusion that there exists no such thing as one homogeneous Jewish type, but that there is a multitude of Jewish types, according to the nations among whom the Jews live and to whom, to a higher or lesser degree, they have assimilated. The German Jews are much more like the other Germans than they are to their coreligionists in Palestine. The similarity appears in the head form, the proportions of the body, pigmentation, and facial traits. And even in Jerusalem, a census taken of the Jewish children there showed that among the Aschkenazim there were 40 per cent blonds and 30 per cent blue-eyed, and among the Sephardim 10 per cent blonds and still less blue-eyed, only the decidedly blond or brunet tints having been taken into account.¹³

The census of school children in Germany, taken under the auspices of Virchow, revealed that among 75,000 Jewish children 32 per cent had light hair and 46 per cent light eyes. In Austria the proportion was 28 and 54 per cent respectively, in England 26 and 41 per cent, and so forth. The purely brunet type has been preserved only by about half of the European Jews, while about 10 per cent are pure blonds (fair complexion, light eyes and hair), the rest being of mixed racial features. As to noses, Fischberg, after examining 4,120 individuals, found out that but a small minority of Jews are blessed with olfactory organs of a crooked form, but it is just this small number of crooked noses which strike the eye, and not the large number of straight ones. A straight ("Greek") nose was found in 57 per cent of the males and 59 per cent of the females. Crooked noses were noted in 14 per cent and 13 per cent respectively. From this we may learn how unreliable popular ideas respecting racial types are. The fact is, that many of the traits commonly believed to be Jewish characteristics are in reality of the most diverse derivations.

These traits, moreover, are by no means restricted to the Jews, but are met with in a great many other peoples, a fact which has given rise to the manifold speculations respecting the whereabouts of the lost Ten Tribes of Israel. Peculiarly striking is the occurrence of Jewish types among the higher classes in Japan,

even among the Imperial Family. One of the finest ladies of Tokio would be regarded in Europe as of Jewish blood (Ranke). The present King of Spain strongly reminds one of certain caricatures of Jews in our comic papers ; in surveying the ancestral portraits of the House of Hapsburg one finds Jewish traits in a surprising multitude. A prominent German anti-Semite, Theodor Fritsch, detected Jewish types even among the Hohenzollern family. Like similarities seem patent in pictorial representations of the Incas of Peru, in some princely families of Java, in many German and French aristocratic families of the oldest standing, in Dutch patrician families, and furthermore, among many primitive races such as the Bakairis of South America, the Kaffirs of South Africa, the Papuans, some Polynesian and Micronesian and North American Red Indian tribes, etc. Stratz, from whom some of these statements are taken,¹⁴ therefore declares that Jewish appearance is the effect of protracted inbreeding, as indeed practised in ruling dynasties, castes, and aristocratic families, and also in areas of local isolation (e.g. small islands, forests, the Ghetto). It was the absence of crossings which, according to this author, developed in the Jews the characteristics of the white race to an extreme degree.

The fact that we nearly always can tell a Jew at a glance from other people seems very often due not so much to physical as to psychical and social characteristics, such as name, bearing, manner of speech, ocular expression, etc. That the outward appearance is influenced also by the mode of life becomes visible from the following instance given by Luschan : In the isle of Rhodes the Jews have monopolized for some 400 years the profession of porters, so that on Saturdays no ship can unload her cargo. The result has been that the Jews of Rhodes to-day count among the tallest people, their average stature being, he says, nearly as tall as that of the Scotch, and surpassing that of the Swedes. He sees in this an effect of unconscious selection.

The Jews, unquestionably, are the product of manifold crossings. The enormous share they took, and still take, in the intellectual and moral development of the world is therefore a strong proof against the alleged noxiousness of racial crossings.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VI

¹ M. Hoernes, *Natur- und Urgeschichte*, i, p. 122; T. Ribot, *L'Hérédité psychologique*, 1914, p. 344; Alfred Fouillée, *Temperament et caractère selon les individus, les sexes et les races*, 1901, p. 339; McDougall, *The Group Mind*, 1921, p. 242.

² Cf. G. Schnapper-Arndt, *Sozialstatistik*, 1908, p. 484. To Boeckh's arguments I should like to add that Jewish-Christian crossings are mostly to be found among the well-to-do and cultured classes, who for reasons of comfort have fewer children than the proletariat. A comparison therefore is not in place.

³ Mjöen, "Harmonische und unharmonische Kreuzungen," *ZE.*, 1921-2, p. 470. Cf. also the views of different authors quoted by Gregory, p. 225 seq.

⁴ Cf. F. Ratzel, *Anthropogeography*, i; F. von Luschan's *Völker, Rassen, Sprachen*, pp. 26, 59, is especially to be recommended. Among other things this writer remarks "that horses and asses are far more distantly related than human groups, yet their crossing, the mule, has excellent qualities, for many tasks mules are far more valuable than horses or asses".

⁵ E. Brückner, *Geschichte der russischen Literatur*, 1909, pp. 194 seq. Another well-known Russian poet, Bunin-Zukovsky, was of Oriental descent, *ibid.*, p. 194. Pushkin had a decided Negro type inherited from his mother, but had blue eyes. F. Haumant, *Pouchkine*, 1911, pp. 14 seq.

⁶ G. Lanson, *Histoire de la littérature française*, 10th edition, pp. 957, 1052.

⁷ G. Brandes, "Die romantische Schule in Frankreich" (*Literatur des 19. Jahrhunderts*, vol. v), 1883, p. 392.

⁸ Eugen Fischer, *Die Rehobother Bastards und das Bastardierungsproblem der Menschen*, 1913.

⁹ This Fischer calls "Luxurieren". Boas says the same thing of crossings between Indians and Whites, and Mjoen of that between Lapps and Norwegians.

¹⁰ Cf. *Inter-Racial Problems*, edited by G. Spiller, 1911, pp. 377 seq.

¹¹ Luschan, *Völker, Rassen und Sprachen*, pp. 112, 165 seq. The writer says that the supposed Jewish type is a common Oriental one, and is often found among Aryan-speaking peoples.

¹² Cf. Dr. Maurice Fischberg, "Die Rassenmerkmale der Juden" (*The Racial Characteristics of the Jews*), 1913, with 42 plates, *ibid.*, "On Race Mixtures," pp. 239-55; further, J. Renan, *Le Judaïsme comme race et religion*, 1883.

¹³ Cf. F. Schiff, "Anthropologische Untersuchungen an jüdischen Kindern in Jerusalem," *AA.*, 1914, p. 348. The Aschkenazim mainly come from Germany, Poland, etc., where blondness is very widespread.

¹⁴ Cf. Stratz, *Was sind Juden? Eine ethnographisch-anthropologische Studie*, 1903.

CHAPTER VII

RACE MINGLING AND DECAY OF NATIONS

THE FALL OF ROME

THE cause of the decline and fall of ancient Rome, according to Gobineau, Chamberlain, and their school, was the physical and moral degeneracy of the Roman people occasioned through incongruous race mixture. The protracted infiltration of the blood of slaves and freedmen, mostly of Semitic and African extraction, unnerved the Roman people and transformed it into an amorphous mass of mestizoes without any definite character whatever. "Like a cataract the alien blood poured down into the nearly depopulated city of Rome, and soon the Romans had ceased to exist." In such style Chamberlain's pen goes on revelling in describing the abjectness of the "raceless chaos", as he calls this historical period. Ignorant, superstitious, characterless, dastardly, it was, this raceless chaos, and it has not yet ceased to operate mischief in its effects, for its offspring is the adulterated Christianity of the Catholic church and all the other forms of universalist spirit, mainly capitalism and its antagonist, socialism. "Even to-day," he says, "the whole of our intellectual and spiritual development stands under the curse of this fatal hybridism, it is this which still in the nineteenth century places the weapons in the hands of all anti-national, race-destroying elements." From this viewpoint the invasion of the Roman empire by the Teutons naturally must be considered as a deed of salvation, and whosoever dares to question this is told by Chamberlain in his own mild way "that only pitiable lack of brain-power or shameless misrepresentation of historical facts can see in the advent of the Teutons anything but the saving of agonizing humanity from the clutches of the eternal bestial". The Teutons first brought into the world the idea of liberty, it was they who rescued Christianity, and indeed the culture of the whole world.

This assumption is one of the mainstays of every race theory. W. D. Babington, in a learned and clever study, showed it to have been one of the earliest and most widespread of all race hypotheses, and attests that the view of the degeneration of the Roman people

and the regenerative influence of the Teutonic blood was a general notion in his time (1886).¹ Explanations for this degeneration of the Roman people have been sought for in different quarters, e.g. in the alleged natural growing senility and decaying of nations, or in the systematic extermination of the best stocks (Seeck) or even in climatic changes. Stress was first laid on racial deterioration, as far as we know, by Count Gobineau, though previous to him this subject had been touched upon by some writers as one of the causes of the fall of the Roman Empire, for instance, by Gibbon.

Surely there can be no doubt that racial crossings of the most manifold kind occurred at the beginning as well as at the end of the historical evolution of the ancient nations. According to the Roman legend Romulus and Remus gathered around them a host of runaway slaves and loafers and founded with them the town of Rome, which they opened as an asylum even to malefactors. Few of these first founders of Rome knew the names of their own fathers.² But not only does tradition tell us that the Romans from their very beginnings were of a mixed origin. For a long time inter-marriages between patricians and plebians were interdicted, and of course also between citizens and aliens. Later on, however, the Romans were much more liberal than the Greeks in bestowing citizenship upon vanquished peoples, and Plutarch sees in this the chief reason for their rapid expansion. Why then did not the initial crossings with the non-Aryan Ligurians and Etruscans prevent the rise of Rome? The assertion that in later times racial crossing engendered degeneracy and corruption is indeed quite untenable. To-day the races of the whole universe gather in London and New York, where there are even Chinese quarters. Will future historians be warranted in ascribing to race mixture the moral depravity in these cities, for which illustrative quotations from contemporary authors will not be difficult to find? True, as an effect of the Punic, Greek, and Asiatic wars there came to Italy great multitudes of outlandish slaves such as were best suited for field-labour; but a considerable number of the Roman slaves (Fustel de Coulanges puts it at one half³) were at all times Italic, besides the great numbers of Greek, Celt, and in later times Teutonic slaves, all Aryans and many of them Nordics.⁴ One must not imagine, however, that much chance was given to the field slaves to influence to any appreciable degree the racial composition of the Romans. According to Roman law slaves could not contract marriages, a principle which was strictly adhered to, especially in regard to rural slaves.⁵ They were treated with the

utmost inhumanity' so that Mommsen could say of them: "As compared to Roman slavery the sum of all Negro sufferings was but a drop." ⁶ In the best possible case they were allowed to live in promiscuity. But then it was the experience of all slave holding epochs, corroborated also through the newest and best known facts of social economy in America, that slaves were unable to propagate, wherefore their number had always to be filled up by new imports. The reason for this lies in the circumstance that the number of female slaves, whose labour value is naturally inferior, was but small, and secondly, in the well-known fact that promiscuity makes sterility; and finally also in the inhuman treatment of slaves. ⁷ Far different was the situation of the industrial and intellectual slaves in the large cities where a gracious lord could allow them to marry, of course only a person of their own condition, for according to a *Senatus Consultum Claudianum* a free woman who had intercourse with a slave fell into slavery. ⁸ Even a freedman could not marry without the consent of his lord; and for the matrimonial alliance between a freedman and a free Roman woman the consent of the Senate as well as of the people was required (Livy, xxxix, 19). As a matter of fact Roman citizenship was the precondition for a regular marriage; the offspring of a Roman citizen with a woman of non-Roman citizenship was considered as illegitimate. These legal provisions prove in themselves that the Romans were averse to crossings, this arising out of caste prejudice, ⁹ and when in a later period these prejudices had slackened down a law of the Emperor Valentinian prohibited intermarriages on pain of death between Romans and barbarians. ¹⁰ From other sources also we learn that the civilized Romans, in common with most other cultured nations, nourished a haughty aversion against union with culturally lower races, and that this aversion extended even to such peoples as in other cultural spheres occupied a high rank. The Emperor Augustus considered it a principle of the utmost importance that the Roman people "must be preserved, pure and untainted of the admixture of alien and slave blood". He therefore very rarely conferred the right of citizenship (Suetonius, *Augustus*, cap. 40). The offspring of unions between Romans and aliens were styled "hybridæ", a term otherwise only used in speaking of cross-breeds between animals of different species, e.g. horses and donkeys. ¹¹ Virgil (*Æneid*, viii, 688) reproaches Mark Antony for having married an Egyptian and calls this a crime ("nefas"), though Cleopatra was the offspring of one of the most noble royal families of her time. Horace (*Odes*, iii, 5) speaks of a soldier who by having

married a barbarian woman covered himself with ignominy. Even the Emperor Titus when ascending the throne was forced by public opinion to divorce his Jewish queen Berenice, although, as Suetonius remarks, he did this but very reluctantly. And still at a very late epoch of the Byzantine Empire, when "chaos" was in full swing, one of the emperors strongly emphasized the old unbroken Roman custom of abstaining from intermixture with aliens.¹²

It does not seem, therefore, that racial promiscuity went on at such a rapid rate and to such an extent as Chamberlain asserts. The aristocrats especially were held in check by law, traditions, and prejudices. The effective power in the Roman Republic lay in the hands of a few noble families distinguished by extraordinary pride and disdain for all those who were of lower birth. Fustel de Coulanges (pp. 263, 279) gives illustrative quotations for his assertion that each separate aristocratic class in Rome regarded with contempt even those who were but one degree lower than themselves. The possibility of rising from a lower to a higher class of nobility was restricted through artificial impediments and could be effected only to the extent of one degree in every generation, without the possibility of skipping over a degree. The people respected this social order, and a "homo novus", an upstart without aristocratic ancestry, seldom contrived to obtain the commoners' votes for an office. But the emperors also were for a long time powerless to make up to their favourites the lack of noble birth. Ill-assorted matches were likewise made difficult by custom and law, and infringements against this observance were especially made difficult for the higher officials in the provinces. A man of senatorial rank was indeed never allowed, from the times of Cæsar, to be domiciled abroad except on public mission. All public functionaries in the provinces, however, were strictly forbidden, for administrative as well as for social reasons, to contract marriages with persons of the same province, either for themselves or for their sons while minors. Marriage promises were held as not binding even when made between relatives of the official in office. And custom in matters of social prejudice we venture to say will have been even stricter than law. With due consideration for all these facts it seems highly improbable that the noble families of Rome threw away their racial pride in favour of African and Syrian slaves.

Marriages with noble Greeks and Gauls, however, can hardly have been followed by the dire consequences depicted by Chamberlain. Even in the latest times of the Empire, on the territories of

the new barbarian states, senatorial descent was held as an almost awe-inspiring prestige both by Romans and Teutons.¹³

During the imperial epoch of Rome the art of the portrait bust attained its highest expression, and painted portraits of Roman personages have come down to us, but even Chamberlain's unerring instinct will find it hard to trace in them any radical change of the Roman racial type. Not only the physical type of the Romans, but their psychological features also do not seem to have undergone any greater change except that which is conditioned by the natural development of society to a higher standard of civilization with all its advantages and drawbacks. Luxury and vice, it is true, more and more gained ground in this development, and foreign examples were in many respects of corrupting effect. But does this presuppose race mixture? Does the spread of tobacco smoking in Europe, or of whisky drinking in Africa, prove an admixture of red-skin blood in Europeans, or of white blood in the Negroes? As early as the third and second century B.C., when nobody, not even Chamberlain, can trace racial adulteration in the Roman people, at a time truly to be called the heroic age of Rome, we find reports of horrid corruptions ruling in aristocratic circles.¹⁴

The corruption of the later epochs of the Roman empire, moreover, must not be exaggerated in favour of the former. Even Gobineau, curious to say, admitted that in respect to energy and morals the imperial epoch was greater than the republican epoch. The general conception that imperial Rome was of an unparalleled moral depravity rests on a too literal acceptance of the fury of invectives hurled by the ascetic Fathers of the Church in their denunciations of paganism. Roman history has shown that this belief was founded on false premises. W. D. Babington, for instance, has demonstrated forcibly that the much exaggerated moral degeneracy of Rome could by no means have brought about her fall.

The only instance Chamberlain adduces in detail as a "proof" of the degeneracy of the ancient classical spirit is a character sketch by the Greek-Syrian writer Lucian, whom he delineates as a witty, vainglorious, characterless, bel esprit, "not without generous impulses (p. 303), but lacking in high ideals, profound conviction and thorough insight." This sketch is a climax of the Chamberlain method. Why did Chamberlain choose precisely Lucian as the representative man of an epoch of five centuries? ¹⁵ Surely the Roman Empire in its later days produced men of loftier intellect than Lucian, for instance, Marcus Aurelius, Julian, Plotinus, Boethius, Augustinus, Ambrosius and all the great Fathers. More

to the point is Schiller's criticism¹⁶; "One could not find more beautiful and striking pictures of to-day's Paris and indeed of all our great cities than Lucian unwittingly made of them in describing Rome. *C'est tout comme chez nous!*" Schiller also praises him for his "glorious truthfulness" and "Socratic simplicity".

As an illustration of the thoroughness and impartiality of Chamberlain's method may also be mentioned his offhand manner of handling the Roman emperors as "mongrels", thereby setting aside the fact that just the very worst of them, Tiberius, Caligula, Nero, Domitian among others, may be considered without doubt of absolutely pure Roman blood. Nero, we learn from Suetonius, was blond and blue-eyed. All of them were either by blood or by adoption related to the august Julian house, whose founder was great Cæsar himself. Can one believe that this proudest of all noble Roman families, which traced its descent back to Æneas, would have mixed their blood with that of African slaves? Chamberlain's sympathetic mildness goes so far as to style Tiberius "an eminent and liberal minded man" because he was not favourably inclined towards the Jews (p. 342). One must marvel then why he omitted to deduce from Julius Cæsar's notorious propensity for the Jews that he was a product of the "chaos". The fact that one speaks of a "Spanish" or a "Syrian" dynasty is sufficient for Chamberlain to maintain that all those Cæsars were a mongrel breed of the lowest races. As a point of fact most of them were offsprings of provincial noble families of the best Roman stock, who very often possessed far greater capability than the Romans born in Rome. If there occurred any crosses, it was certainly not with the dregs of the subdued population, but with families of the highest already Romanized classes, such as indeed were not inferior to the Romans themselves. Making allowance for the small number of insane or inefficient emperors, it may be said that just the provincial Romans contributed most to the long duration of Roman rule. While the nobles living in Rome wasted their energies in material and intellectual luxury, a stronger generation had grown up in the provinces under the stress of hard administrative work, in constant struggle with uncivilized nomads or mountain tribes, or under the fertilizing touch of foreign cultures. With the first "foreigner" on the throne of the Cæsars, namely with Trajan, there really began the time which Gibbon believes was the happiest for humanity throughout the history of the world. Trajan, Hadrian, Antonius Pius, Marcus Aurelius,¹⁷ four of the best emperors that ever ruled in Rome, succeeded each other. The Roman arms were

crowned by victory; and the Empire enjoyed a century's undisturbed development during which the arts and literature attained a zenith of unrivalled perfection. Can this have been brought about by outlandish "mestizoes"? Does not this root up the very foundations of race theory? Of course, what has just been maintained, respecting the Roman provincial families, holds good for the descent of these emperors. Marcus Ulpius Trajanus came from a Spanish family of "uncontested Italic derivation". His successor Hadrian, was a scion of the Spanish branch of the house of the Ælii to whom Rome owed a number of her greatest men. His family had emigrated to Spain at the time of Scipio. Antoninus Pius belonged to a noble Roman family settled in Gaul, his grandfather was Consul and Prefect of the police in Rome, and so forth. For Chamberlain all this is insignificant. Without taking heed of historical facts he goes rambling on, just as it suits his humour. He expressly means these emperors when, without mincing the matter, he says: "Not one of them probably was distantly related to those men who with sure intuitive instinct created the Roman commonwealth." The Romans, according to Chamberlain, were "for all times" barred from imperial dignity!

True, in later times it occurred more and more frequently that lansquenet leaders of low provincial extraction by dint of their prowess and through the favour of the legions rose to the imperial throne, but to these princes also—non-Romans undoubtedly—Rome was indebted for much advancement. These rough soldiers—superstitious and ignorant of culture, but energetic and not unfrequently moved by a professionally limited sense of duty—were possessed of just such qualities as those perilous times demanded. Such men as Aurelian, Probus, Diocletian, Constantine and many others, did more for the defence of the Empire than any preceding "true" Roman, though their low birth, which in many cases was left intentionally in the dark, makes their race very doubtful. It is probable that the blood of Roman soldiers and colonists also flowed in their veins. Chamberlain cannot quite ignore the rescuing activity of these men. A figure like Diocletian, who by a new administrative organization gave the Empire for centuries a new stay, was too powerful to be set aside as a "mongrel" even by Chamberlain. Therefore he decrees (p. 307) "the great Diocletian was the last emperor of pure blood". Theodosius and all the rest were mongrels. Diocletian, however, was in reality an Illyrian freedman of lowest derivation. Chamberlain himself ~~calls~~ him an "Illyrian shepherd" (p. 151). Thus Chamberlain

contradicts himself in here maintaining just the opposite of what he said a moment ago. Of course, he ignores the fact that Theodosius proceeded from a noble Spanish family of Italic origin. Indeed, such trifles never hinder Chamberlain from apodictically advancing assertions which he invents freely to serve his purposes.

What the race theorists have in common is the assertion that racial degeneration is to bear blame for the fall of ancient civilizations. But how was this brought about? Seeck¹⁸ believes that the extermination of the best individuals was caused by party strife, civil wars, persecution of Christians, celibacy, etc., but rejects the Gobineau-Chamberlain theory of the noxiousness of race mixture, unless it be just the undesirable elements of a race which form the crossing. He even inclines to see an advantage in the crossing of races. Only the wholesale extinction of the noblest and best, he believes, was conducive to a general debasement of the racial level. Another race theorist, Reibmayer,¹⁹ ably controverts Seeck's opinion and even believes protracted inbreeding (i.e. the lack of crossings) to have been the cause of the degeneration, cultural progress being, he considers, conditioned by the regular alternation of crossing and inbreeding. In the progressive intermixture of the races of the earth he sees a security for further development. These three theories evidently are in clashing contradiction to one another, and yet Chamberlain advises the study of Reibmayer's excellent work "as the indispensable complement of his own ideas".²⁰

The prominent historian of ancient Greece and Rome, Professor Julius Beloch, in his books very often shows a marked aversion to all race mixture and sometimes entangles himself in very curious contradictions concerning these questions (cf. Kromayer, *Hist. Zschr.*, vol. c, 1908, against Beloch). Yet Beloch in a remarkable article on the "Decay of Antique Culture" (*Hist. Zeitschrift*, vol. lxxxiv, 1900) absolutely avoids all explanation of this decay by racial arguments. He says that the "extermination of the best elements", asserted by Seeck, never has taken place and that there is not the faintest proof of a degeneration.

The decline of Greece in the beginning was purely political, and it was Roman tyranny which brought about cultural decay.

SOCIAL REASONS FOR THE RISE AND DECLINE OF ROME

The tillers of the rich fertile plains, such as in Mesopotamia, Egypt, and China, at all times were a peace-loving element, because to them and their children nature offered abundant food. Also,

in most cases, they were unable, in the open, defenceless plain, to preserve their liberty, so that they either fell under the rule of barons or a priestly bureaucratic monarchy. Far different were the conditions in mountainous or wooded countries, in Assyria, Judæa, Macedonia, Rome, Switzerland.²¹ There, stout, self-conscious peasant tribes could stand their ground and easily defend their liberty, but they were forced to conquer new colonial land for their children, because the poor soil of their country was not sufficient for them all. On these grounds the expansive world empires of Assyria, Macedonia, and Rome came into existence. The Swiss and the Jews too, migrated through many countries, as soldiers first and then as traders. In this process of expansion the vigorous peasantry as a rule were urged onwards by a warlike aristocracy under the leadership of a national king, the power between these factors being evenly balanced. This comparative balance of power between king, aristocracy, and peasants, when maintained justly, prevents degeneration into royal despotism, such as is found in most parts of the ancient Orient, or into a feudal or democratic anarchy such as ruled in Hellas, and in the later Teutonic states. This equilibrium, therefore, is one of the essential prerequisites for any lasting military and political expansion of power. The old empires nearly all perished through the fact that the peasantry, exhausted by the endless wars, let all power lapse into the hands of a despot or an aristocratic caste, which instead of the national armies employed mercenaries whose profligacy in the end led the empire to perdition.

In Rome the greatest display of power coincided with the social rise of the peasants (Mommson, p. 445). After each victory peasant settlers were sent out to form colonies and the veteran soldier took to the plough. In this way Rome set to the world the most impressive example of enormous political and economic energy slumbering in free labour.²² And still more impressive is the example of Rome's fall. In the old Roman commonwealth there never existed such harsh contrasts between the several social classes as in Hellas. There was, it is true, a patrician caste in Rome, but its members were themselves little better than hard working peasant proprietors whose highest aim was to preserve their land, who held in disdain such frivolities as knightly sports, the theatre, art, and science. Then, by degrees, an economic system based on slave labour crept in, the hereditary land-holders themselves set the plough aside, and made war prisoners do the work for them. Hence in place of workers they became lords. In the course of time their arrogance

and inefficiency became a serious danger for Rome. The small peasant proprietors grew poor and were forced to sell their holdings, they thus were replaced by latifundia and their slaves—a sort of usurious capitalism based on the exploitation of the provincials, slaves, and peasants developed. Rome still continued to proceed on her way of conquest, with no purposeful aim for universal rule; by the sheer necessity of securing the already achieved conquests she was pushed farther and farther abroad until finally a large part of the then known universe fell to her possession as a heritage of the whole preceding trend of events. Social incongruities and the utter impossibility of governing a universal empire on the principles and in the forms of the old municipal administration which as yet was ignorant of any sort of a representative constitution, the inner conflicts arising from such a state of things drove with natural force towards the monarchy, which then indeed secured peace, a certain degree of prosperity, and in general the existence of Rome for some centuries to come. But slavery formed the feet of clay of this colossus. It prevented the formation of a free industrial middle class and the regeneration of the land-holding peasantry, who through the wars of the Republic had dwindled rapidly, and in general slavery had a demoralizing effect. The mercenary stepped into the place of the free citizen soldier; law and order were superseded by prætorian rule. Slavery also, through its cheap and rough labour, prevented all technical progress²³; the formation of industrial capital and the development of the tax-paying capacity were hampered. In this situation the Roman Empire was incessantly beset by innumerable wild barbarian hordes which at any moment threatened to flood over the frontiers and could only be opposed by the tactical skill of the legions, and not by the superiority of repeating rifles. The legions also had for a long time been composed of barbarian mercenaries, very often even more dangerous enemies than their brethren on the other side of the frontier. In the interior there fermented the powerful social and moral forces of growing Christianity which in regard to the State was indifferent or even hostile in its attitude, so that just the best of the emperors believed it their duty to drown the unpatriotic, dangerous doctrine in blood. Thus the struggle raged on in the interior as well as around the frontiers of the Roman Empire. To this must be added the circumstance that the level of technical progress at that ~~time~~ was not such as to assure for any length of time the integrity of a world empire. This has been made possible by modern develop-

ment only, with its world-wide economic interconnexions, its railways, telegraph, standing armies, cannons, and navies, with its principles of decentralization, national economy, and statistics. In the old times, as already said, the economic system of slavery prevented every technical, moral and political progress: development had come to a deadlock, from which an issue was only possible by a retrograde movement, a new epoch of barbarism.

The social development of the old world in its last phase immobilized all professions and led to a general enslavement and brutalization. The State seemed indeed to exist merely for the exclusive benefit of the big landowners, the high officials, and the soldiery. In the third and fourth centuries, in Gaul particularly, there raged uninterrupted upheavals of despondent rural labourers. In the fifth century whole troops of Romans went over to the barbarians and Salvian, a patristic writer, states that he marvelled all poor people did not do the same.²⁴

Despite all this, Rome continued to live not only in the Roman church, but also in the Byzantine Empire. The fall of the Western Empire did not touch the Empire of the East, whose rulers went on calling themselves "Emperors of the Romans"; under their powerful protection the classical tradition lived on, and the foundations of modern political administration were laid. Though Byzantine life seems to us sad and gloomy, full of all sorts of horrors and abominations, we yet do not forget the enormous struggles this Empire had to face from the first to the last minutes of its existence. The waves of the great migration of peoples, of the Crusades, of Islam, all broke against the rocky shore of Byzantium. What this Empire achieved in a thousand years' strife against Teutons, Huns, Slavs, Bulgars, Avars, Persians, Arabs, Turks, Normans, French, Spaniards, Venetians and other enemies, equals the heroic deeds of ancient Rome. And though foreign hireling troops fought her battles, yet the spirit pervading her and directing the arms of her foreign mercenaries was that of ancient Rome.

THE DECAY OF GREECE

For the decay of Greece also, race mixing is frequently made responsible; and yet it is well known that just the initial period of Greek history was decisively influenced by Asiatic races and cultures. The cradle of Hellenic culture was Ionia, the very region where Hellenic and Asiatic elements came into closest touch; and

the other colony, Sicily, came very near it. The grandeur of the Hellenic culture has all its roots in the Ionian spirit. Of Thales, the initiator of Greek philosophy, we know that he was of Semitic stock and that he derived his knowledge from Egypt as is admitted even by Diogenes Laertius who dislikes accepting non-Hellenic influences.²⁵ From the Semites the Greeks borrowed their alphabet and many other elements of culture, especially music, as evidenced by the names of their musical instruments. Wirth explains the name "Homeros" from the Semitic "zammeru" = "singer".²⁶ Of Theseus, Plutarch says (*Theseus*, 24) that for the foundation of Athens he said: "Come hither, all ye nations!" Herodotus (i, 56-7) attributes to the Athenians non-Hellenic descent and lays stress upon the fact that some of the most distinguished Athenian families were of foreign origin (v, 65-6). The florescence of Athens depended on the international, hospitable character of the city. As contrasted to this, aristocratic Sparta proudly secluded herself from all contact with the world abroad. Foreigners even were not allowed to reside in Sparta, although in later times this law could not be strictly observed. According to Herodotus (ix, 33-5) the Spartans never bestowed citizenship upon any foreigner, except to two brothers to whom it was reluctantly granted in consideration of special services.²⁷ Marriages, however, could not be contracted by persons who had not the rights of citizenship. Even between citizens of the several Hellenic towns marriages were impossible, except by virtue of the rarely granted right of epigamy, and this practically never occurred between Hellenes and barbarians. Sparta therefore was of a much purer Hellenic stock than Athens, and yet it remained culturally sterile, while strongly mixed Athens became the sun of Hellenic culture. The strictest ban on race mixing, which even in later times slackened very little,²⁸ could not save Sparta from falling, first among all Greek commonwealths, into utter moral and political degeneracy and depopulation.

But even in Athens, where foreigners were well received, race mixture was by no means favoured in later times. It is remarkable that just in the beginning of her history Athens was easy in bestowing rights of citizenship upon alien residents, and that even children of illegitimate birth from relations between citizens and aliens were entered on the registers of citizenship. Kleisthenes even went so far as to cause a mass reception of alien residents and freedmen. And just the succeeding generations were the protagonists of the heroic age of Athens; from this mixture proceeded the men of Marathon and Salamis whose sons and grandsons created the

Athens of Pericles! If such were the results of cross-breeding how ardently do we desire them for ourselves! Things changed in after-days. In proportion as, in the course of democratic development, the political prerogatives, and for the poor classes the material advantages inherent in citizenship also, became greater, the citizens began to restrict the admission of foreigners more and more.²⁹ Racial pride grew with the florescence of Athens to extraordinary proportions. As early as the fifth century citizenship was only granted in consideration of extraordinary merit, on the ground of a plebiscitum, which, however, could be juridically opposed by any Athenian on the plea of unworthiness of the enfranchized. If the jury found the protest justified, the person concerned fell into slavery. In the fourth century, the proceeding grew still more rigorous: a preliminary plebiscitum was required; then a second meeting of at least 6,000 citizens decided on granting the enfranchisement, and even this decision was liable to appeal. From the beginning of the third century onward citizenship was granted in a more liberal spirit, but juridical revision was made obligatory for all cases. The political decay of Athens, at that time, however, was already nearing its finality, nothing could hold back the tide. In vain frequent revisions of the registers of citizenship were made, whereby those found in default had to pay for this by being enslaved. When, under Pericles, frumentations were to be distributed, 5,000 among 19,000 citizens were expelled for unrighteous acquisition of citizenship and were sold as slaves. Many of them were innocent.³⁰ Henceforward every alien resident married to an Athenian woman was in the danger of losing his property and of being sold as a slave; and if an Athenian was married to an alien woman, she was threatened by the same fate and he was subject to a fine of 1,000 drachmas.³¹ Aristotle informs us that in Athens only such persons could be citizens as could prove both their parents to have been citizens; and in many other cities this proof was extended to the great-grandparents, and still farther back.³² Therefore we can take it only as one of the usual exaggerations of the panegyrist Isokrates when he asserts³³ that all the citizens of long standing had been exterminated through the long wars. It is true that during the Peloponnesian War aliens were enfranchized to fill up the gaps among the citizens, to the great indignation of the orators, but soon the old rigour was reverted to. In any case it was only the question of admitting other Hellenes, not barbarians. When Philip V of Macedonia demanded that in the city of Larissa the metics of Hellenic race should be admitted to citizenship, the Larissan:

only very reluctantly acceded to this wish.³⁴ Athenian citizenship became more easy of access only after Alexander's death. Yet at all times the contempt of the Hellenes for the barbarians remained the same, and even the Macedonians were considered as barbarians.³⁵ Till the time when Rome was already in the plenitude of her power, the Romans were only barbarians in the eyes of the Hellenes; nay, more, when Greece had for a long time been a Roman province, some of the Greeks, as is evidenced by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, still called the Romans not barbarians, but the worst of barbarians.³⁶ And despite all this we are to believe that the Hellenes without further ado mixed with Syrian and African slaves? The number of Asiatic and African slaves in Greece, by the way, was never as large as in Rome, because the Greeks derived their slaves mostly from the neighbouring tribes of the Thracians, Scythians, etc., who were all Nordics and spoke Indogermanic languages.

Chamberlain explains the racial deterioration of the Greeks by the invasion of foreign, unrelated tribes (p. 266). The epoch of these invasions, however, forbids any such explanation quite apart from the fact that the invaders were predominantly Aryans and even Nordics, with whom the crossings should be considered, according to the race theory, as a wholesome refreshment of the blood.³⁷ The Celts after their defeat (280 B.C.) did not settle at all in Hellas but migrated onwards. More than five centuries had elapsed after the complete downfall of Greece before the first Teutons settled there. In the sixth century A.D. the Bulgarian assaults began, but only in the eighth century did these tribes, who in the meantime had adopted Slavonic speech, get a firm footing in Hellas proper, where at first they lived in separate communities without mixing with the Hellenes. Only in the ninth century, when under the Byzantine emperor Basilius I (867-86) they had accepted the Christian faith, amalgamation with the Greeks became possible, and in fact took place on a large scale. And strange to say, this first great race-mixing which a thousand years after the definite decline of Greece brought a Finnic-Turk-Slav strain into the Hellenic blood, seems to have had the most favourable results. From this time onward Greece revives again, prosperity and civilization increase, the whole Empire sees a new epoch of florescence. In the twelfth century Greece was one of the most progressive parts of the Empire, and might have brought forth a Renaissance like that of Italy but for the Latin Crusaders who like a destroying avalanche swept over Byzantium.³⁸ The Franks introduced into Greece the feudal system which manifested its decomposing effects

by unending bloody feuds. The intolerance of the Catholic Franks who tried to force their own customs, language, and religion upon reluctant populations, marks this most lamentable period of Greek history. Only then was the Roman Empire ripe for downfall and it succumbed under the assaults of the Turks, after having previously placed in the hands of the then rising Italian culture the conscientiously preserved treasures of the classic age.

The allegation that classic culture perished through racial deterioration contrasts clashingly with historic truths. It is a phrase that is widely spread on account of its easy currency, but utterly meaningless in the light of historical criticism. The vicissitudes of the classical world, on the contrary, are with absolute certainty to be traced to social processes, economic disarrangements more particularly, and to their effects on the military constitution.³⁹

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

An interesting application of the Race Theory is the conception of the French Revolution as a struggle between the ruling Teutonic and the subdued Celtic races. Here we find one of the oldest sources of this line of thought, which also throws some light on its psychology. Race theory thereby discloses itself in a striking measure as a weapon in the struggle of classes. Dr. Ludwig Woltmann,⁴⁰ on the contrary, maintains that the leading revolutionary personages were of Teutonic race, as appeared to him from the study of their portraits. By some historians, however, it has been contested that the number of the Frank immigrants was very large,⁴¹ while on the other hand the French nobility had suffered the heaviest bleedings on the battle-fields.⁴² As a matter of fact it is notorious that a very large portion of the French aristocracy at the time of the revolution was not of very old standing, and also that they had acquired their patents by not quite commendable means. Patents of nobility were often bought because of the exemption from taxation they conferred.⁴³ This has been laid bare most characteristically by Count Volney. In his famous book *The Ruins*, written in part before the Revolution, but published only afterwards, we find the following passage: "Some others (noblemen) said: 'It would be shameful and vile to mix with the populace whose task it is to serve us; we are of the noble and pure race of the conquerors of this country. Let us recall to the minds of the masses our rights and our origin.' Thereupon they addressed the people: 'People, hast thou forgotten that our forefathers conquered the country and

that thy race has been spared under the express condition to serve us ? ’ and so forth. The people : ‘ Pure race of the conquerors, show us thy pedigrees that we may see whether such deeds as are considered thefts and frauds when committed by single persons become virtues when made by a whole nation.’ And in the same moment loud voices from out of the crowd began to call out many noble names, denounced their descent and relationship and told how their grandfather, or great-grandfather, or even their father, after having in some way or other acquired riches, had bought for money their nobility, so that only a small number of families was left who really were of old descent. ‘ Look here,’ said those voices, ‘ look at these upstarts who deny their own parents, these plebeian recruits who think themselves glorious veterans ! ’ And a mocking laugh arose all around.” This witty peer of France, we dare say, must have known the composition of his own social sphere. This whole hypothesis after all breaks down under the striking obviousness of the social causes of the French Revolution. And by the way, how can it be explained that just the Celtic districts of France (Brittany and Vendée) stood up to the last drop of their blood for aristocratic rule against the alleged Celtic revolution ?

RACE MIXTURE AND CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

The allegation of the race theorists that crosses of different races lead to degeneracy is worthless for the mere reason that none of them sticks to a clear definition of what he really means by a “ different ” race. We are never told whether perchance only black and white are to be considered as “ diverging ” races, or also white “ Aryans ” and white “ Semites ”: or whether among the Aryans the Teutons are to be singled out as contrasted against the Slavs, or even whether also the Teutonic races, viz. the English, Germans, etc., are to be considered as racially different ? What is less precarious, a cross of German speaking round-heads with French or Slav speaking round-heads, or a cross between German round and long-heads ? Even those among the race theorists who go so far as to define their notion of race practically never abide by it but arbitrarily employ the term race now in the one and then in the other acceptance, without taking heed of the contradictions resulting therefrom.

The assumption that race mixing as a rule must be accompanied by great disadvantage is contradicted frequently by calling attention to the fact that the great cultural centres are to be found just in such regions as are most liable to race mixing. On this Nietzsche;

Treitschke, Rohrbach and others have laid stress. As a point of fact a glance at the continents shows that the height of cultural development stands in exact proportion to the possibilities of race and culture mixings, the geographical position of the respective country in respect to the sea playing an important rôle. Professor K. Schneider even advanced a theory that physical intermixture is a precondition for development⁴⁴; but it seems to me that it is rather the mixture of the spiritual possessions, the discarding of all prejudices and superstitions such as results from the contact with foreign customs, which is most decisive for this. Where different races meet on common ground a crossing of the different culture elements takes place and cultural attainments increase on both sides. Such race contacts naturally ensue on the cross roads of civilization which in themselves are favourable for development. Secondly, racial stratification produces social differentiation. It forms a class of serfs which by means of compulsory labour are educated to steady habits of work; to the ruling class on the other hand is left that leisure requisite for the development of a high standard of life, luxury, and a more refined culture. And although this social differentiation brings with it many dangers for a safe development, it yet may give an impulse, supposing always that the conditions are favourable, for specially rapid progress.

All nations of any importance in history show a mixture of different races. As early as the dim past of history racial mixtures on an extensive scale must have taken place, as is proved by the fact that skulls of the most diverse racial types are found in the very same prehistoric gravefields.⁴⁵ And how extraordinarily mixed appear to have been the oldest rather cultured nations of Egypt, Babylon, and the whole of Western Asia, upon whose attainments rests our whole culture. Flinders Petrie, from representations on Egyptian monuments, describes five different types of races who ruled successively over Egypt. Among these were Negroes. According to Herodotus (ii, p. 100) eighteen Negro kings ruled over Egypt, as he had learned from Egyptian priests who read to him from their books. In Mesopotamia we find in the beginning the quite enigmatical people of the Sumerians, who certainly were neither Semites nor Aryan, but who had already attained to a very high culture and whose language in later times was cultivated by the Semitic Babylonians as the language of science, just the same as Europe spoke Latin in the Middle Ages. Over the whole of Western Asia and Egypt the Babylonian language was

of higher society, in the same way as French has been used in more recent times throughout Europe. But would it seem justified for this reason to style the Babylonian culture, which forms indeed one of the foundations of our own culture, as Semitic?

This we could do evidently only by discarding the idea of racial giftedness, for we cannot know at all to which race the several creators of culture belonged.⁴⁶ Also the Kasites, probably an Aryan tribe, ruled over Babylon for some six hundred years, but they were rapidly Semitized. Finally, came the Aryan Medes and Persians and conquered the country. The Persians were Aryans in the more narrow sense, their kings called themselves "Aryans of the Aryan tribe". Their closest kin were the Medes, but with them it seems that only a ruling class spoke the Aryan tongue, while the masses of the people, as inscriptions tell us, spoke the Elamitic, or new-Susan language, which certainly was not Aryan. The Medes, we learn from an inscription of Tiglatpileser IV, were called the dark-skinned; on the well-known mosaic, "The Battle of Alexander," the Persians have black beards.⁴⁷

In Western Asia the Hittites were an important nation. Their language, as Hrozný and other authorities have shown, bore strong Aryan similarities, while their facial type was made conspicuous by big and crooked noses. Their neighbours were the Mitanni who likewise showed Aryan affinities. Also the Amorites and Philistines, the eternal antagonists of the Jews, are to-day by many scholars considered as Indogermanic tribes. Herodotus tells us that the Indogermanic Scythians once overran the whole of Asia as far down as Egypt (i, 105). The town of Bethsean in Palestine was subsequently called Scythopolis and the Scythian name seems to have been preserved in cuneiform inscriptions under the form of Ashguza, corrupted into Ashkenaz in the Old Testament. In other respects also, manifold Aryan influences on the Israelitic-Jewish culture are traceable.⁴⁸ On the other hand an Egyptian king, Herodotus tells us (ii, 103), penetrated as far as the country of the Scythians and Thracians (that is to say, the Northern Balkans), as was made known by triumphal columns; nay even the Colchians far up on the Black Sea were believed to be of Egyptian descent!

That, moreover, the Greeks and Romans since their very beginnings were strongly mixed races has already been demonstrated. Last of all mention must be made also of the high Arabian culture that was far in advance of the Christian one in the Middle Ages. Of this the Arabians alone can by no means claim to be the sole creators,

for they were essentially influenced by Persians, Egyptians, Greeks, North Africans (Berbers), and Jews.

Münsterberg in his *History of Chinese Art* maintains ancient connexions between old Chinese and Greek art. In one of his papers,⁴⁹ moreover, he says that certainly all art is developed in national ways, but never has an art originated exclusively from local germs without foreign initiative and influence. Thus perhaps Persian pottery came to China under Mongolic rule, where it developed into the blue-white porcelain which in its turn appeared in Europe, and through Delft and other imitations, decidedly influenced European style.

The most important of all cultural progresses, namely writing, came from the ancient Orient. Thurnwald has shown how cultural intermixture contributed to this.⁵⁰ The beginnings of writing are found with many primitive peoples,⁵¹ and in some cases these beginnings are very clever, as for instance, a rebus-like sort of memory-aids and figural representations. This stage has not been passed by the Chinese in spite of all perfections. They have never found a way of resolving their pictorial script into syllables and letters. Thurnwald believes that this is due to the fact that the Chinese writing was developed by one and the same people. The Sumerian writing, on the contrary, was taken over by the Semitic Akkadians and Babylonians and this intermixture of races and cultures probably brought about the changing of the signs which originally stood for words into signs for syllables. The Egyptians went even a step farther, probably with the co-operation of aliens, in administrative documents, and to a certain extent they adopted the system of letters besides syllable signs. From them the Phoenicians learnt their use and later on developed the first true letter writing, to which the Greeks afterwards added the vowels. The Phoenician alphabet forms the root for all other alphabets.

In Europe in later times innumerable peoples and intellectual strains intermingled, and it would be quite hopeless to distinguish the separate parts the several races played in the make-up of these cultures. In most cases this would be as impossible as to find out from which river a particular wave in the ocean came.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VII

¹ Cf. William Dalton Babington, *Fallacies of Race Theories*, essays, London (Longman, Green), 1895, pp. 15, 21 seq. Babington points out that especially clerical historians maintain that the Teutons brought about the rejuvenation of Rome, this to show that God called the Teutons to bring about the fall of corrupt Rome and to raise Papacy in its place. But this also seems rather to be a reaction against the conception of Gibbon, Voltaire, and other free-thinkers who threw the blame of the fall of Rome on Christianity.

² Plutarch, *Romulus*, 9-12.

³ Fustel de Coulanges, *Histoire des institutions politiques de l'ancienne France*, 2nd ed., vol. 1, 1877, p. 226

⁴ We have many proofs of the enormous number of Teuton slaves.

⁵ Cf. Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte*, 4th ed., 1865, i, pp. 844-6 seq. Cato hands down the tradition that slaves must either work or sleep. When Greek characters are introduced in Roman comedies and slave marriages occur or the master enters into conversation with his slaves, the Roman writers remind the audience that they are not to be offended at seeing things that are usual in Athens (p. 909).

⁶ Mommsen, vol. ii, p. 78.

⁷ Cf. Loria, who gives numerous examples for what has been asserted here in *Die Sklavenwirtschaft im Altertum und im modernen Amerika*, *Zeitschrift für Social- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, 1896

⁸ Czyhlarz, *Institutionen des römischen Rechts*, 1893, p. 50.

⁹ In the same way as the aristocracy considers it a mesalliance when one of them marries an ordinary citizen

¹⁰ Cf. *Codex Theodosianus*, lib. iii, tit. xiv.

¹¹ Cf. Kolb, *Kulturgeschichte der Menschheit*, 2nd edition, 1872, vol. i, p. 422.

¹² Cf. what Constantine Porphyrogenetos tells his son in Gibbon, *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. Certainly the mixing of races was always on the increase in later times; yet under the first emperors racial pride was so strong that provincials were not considered of equal birth by the inhabitants of the City of Rome. (Cf. Friedländer, *Sittengeschichte Roms*, 1888, vol. i, pp. 225-37.) In the first century A D there were still fifty noble families who claimed descent from Æneas, his companions, or other pre-Roman ancestors.

¹³ See Mommsen, vol. iii, pp. 498, 517. Further, 1, 38, 57, 63, 65; Dig. xxiii, tit. 3; Codex v, 2 Modestinus, *de Ritu nuptiarum*. "Semper in coniunctionibus non solum quid liceat considerandum est, sed et quid honestum sit" (cit. in 2, 42, Dig. xxiii, 3), Fustel de Coulanges, *a. a. O.*, pp. 283 seq., 580 seq.

¹⁴ Cf. Mommsen, vol. i, pp. 805, 807, 884 seq. "He who robs a citizen," says Cato the Elder, "ends his days in chains and fetters; but those who rob the City are clothed in gold and purple." Already in 234 B C complaints were made about the scarcity of marriages, family ties became loosened and divorces increased, terrible crimes were committed by people of the highest rank. In 184, when Cato was censor, he laid a high tax on prostitute boys.

¹⁵ Let us suppose that a large part of our writings were lost and that an historian of the year 4000 on the basis of a few extant works to characterize the period 1500-2000 chanced upon H. St. Chamberlain only, and after an exact description of him then asserted: "Such was the German scholar of the later middle ages!" That would be exactly Houston Stewart Chamberlain's method, but the mere thought of it makes me shudder.

¹⁶ Correspondence between Schiller and Körner, 19, xii, 1787.

¹⁷ The son of Marcus Aurelius, the abject and cruel Commodus, had a beautiful face and the finest golden hair. (Cf. Herodian, i, 7.) However, it is supposed that his real father was a gladiator.

¹⁸ Otto Seeck, *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt*, vol. i, 1897; vol. ii, 1901.

¹⁹ Cf. Dr. Albert Reibmayer, *Inzucht und Vermischung beim Menschen*, 1897.

²⁰ Cf. Chamberlain, *Nachtrage zur 3 Auflage der Grundlagen*, 1901, p. 27.

²¹ For conditions in Assyria, see Landersdorfer, *Kultur der Babylonier und Assyrier*, 1913, pp. 73, 107; for Macedonia, Pohlmann, *Grundriss der griechischen Geschichte*, 1906, p. 214; for Rome, Mommsen's *Römische Geschichte*, i, 187.

²² Recent colonial history offers strong proof for this. France has founded feudal colonies under clerical rule; Spain mining colonies, and the Anglo-Saxons free agricultural colonies, and by these have driven all competition out of the field. (Cf. Hopp, *Bundesstaat und Bundeskrieg in Nordamerika*, 1886, pp. 13, 41, 110 seq.)

²³ Cf. above all Loria's most instructive essay, mentioned above, and further the characteristic remarks of Hopp, pp. 39-40 and 67-8.

²⁴ L. Hartmann, *Der Untergang der antiken Welt*, in Hartmann and Kromayer, *Römische Geschichte*, 1919.

²⁵ Diogenes Laërtius, *Lives of the Philosophers*, book i, also Herodotus. The influence of race mixtures Gomperz also accentuates in his *Griechische Denker*, 1896, vol. i, pp. 5 seq., 11, 23, 415-16; Hegel, *Philosophie der Geschichte* (Reclam), p. 299; see further the different views collected by Billeter, *Die Anschauungen vom Wesen des Griechentums*, 1910, p. 417.

²⁶ Cf. H. Wirth, *Homer and Babylon*, 1921, where many proofs concerning the Semitic influences on the Greeks are given. Later ancient writers deduced all entire Greek knowledge from the Orient in a most exaggerated manner, and made all the celebrated Greek philosophers disciples of the Egyptians, Babylonians, etc. Cf. Diodorus, i, 23, 69, 96; Plutarch, Clement of Alexandria, and others, cf. also O. Willmann, *Geschichte des Idealismus*, 1894, vol. i, p. 47 seq. But already Diogenes Laërtius opposed this. There is no doubt that the great Greek philosophers learned much from the Orient, especially Pythagoras and Plato. The founder of the Stoic school, Zeno, and his most important disciples were certainly Orientals, mainly Semites, and this school not only formed the ideas of the noblest minds of later antiquity, but also mightily influenced the development of the ethical and political principles of our culture. Cf. P. Barth, *Die Stoa*, 3rd edition, 1922. W. Dilthey, *Weltanschauung und Analyse des Menschen seit Renaissance und Reformation*, 1914.

²⁷ The Megares boasted that they had never given the right of citizenship to a stranger except to Heracles, but later they offered it to Alexander the Great, after the oracle had declared him to be a son of the gods.

²⁸ The sons of Spartans and female Helots could be adopted. Some of the greatest Spartans descended from such mixtures, for instance Gylippos, Kalikratides, Lysandros.

²⁹ Cf. Busolt, *Griechische Staats- und Rechtsaltertümer*, 1892, p. 203. Coleman Philippon, *The International Law and Custom of Ancient Greece and Rome*, 2 vols., 1911. Laurent, *Études sur l'histoire de l'humanité*, vol. ii, 1880.

³⁰ Plutarch, *Perikles*, 37.

³¹ Westermarck, *Geschichte der menschlichen Ehe*, 1893, p. 368.

³² Aristotle, *Politik*, translated by Stahr, 1895, p. 172.

³³ Isokrates, *Speech on the Peace*, § 88.

³⁴ Michel Clerc, *Les Mèdèques Athéniens*, Paris, 1893, pp. 301-2.

³⁵ For this reason they were not allowed to attend the Olympic games. Even Aristotle, in spite of his close connexion to their royal house, considered the Macedonians barbarians, and his pupil Alexander was of the opinion that the Hellenes in comparison to his Macedonians might be counted as half-gods. How does that fit in with the assumption that the Hellenes even then were degenerate? See also what J. Juthner says concerning the development and relations of the Hellenes and barbarians in his *Hellenen und Barbaren*, 1923.

³⁶ *Jahrbücher für klassische Philologie*, ix, suppl. vol., 1877-8, p. 116.

³⁷ To prove the assumption that Greece had degenerated because of the weakening of the race, reference is wrongly made to Fallmerayer. This author really places the decay of the Hellenes in the Middle Ages, and even accentuates

very strongly that up to this time the Hellenic race was preserved pure. Vide his *Geschichte der Halbinsel Morea*, 1830, vol. i, p. 91. But even this assertion has since been refuted.

³⁸ Neither the Huns nor the Turks did so much harm to their enemies' countries as the Crusaders did in Christian Constantinople after they had taken it.

³⁹ The cause of the social decay of Greece, which also brought political decay in its train, Pohlmann has described in a masterly manner in his *Grundriss der griechischen Geschichte*, 1906.

⁴⁰ Woltmann, *Politische Anthropologie*, 1903, p. 294; *Die Germanen in Frankreich*, 1907.

⁴¹ Vide Fustel de Coulanges, pp. 470, 472. He says that Chlodwig, when he was baptized had no more than 6,000 Frankish warriors under his command; as opposed to this it should be noticed that the North of France, as a matter of fact, is to a considerable extent blond. Lapouge (p. 56) considers that the total Teuton immigrants amounted to a million.

⁴² At Crècy no less than 1,600 barons and 4,000 knights fell. "There was hardly a noble family in France which did not weep for the loss of one or more of its members" (Prutz, *Staatengeschichte des Abendlandes im Mittelalter*, vol. II, 1887, p. 229). At Maupertuis, 2,400 noblemen fell on the field (p. 234).

⁴³ Sometimes for financial reasons many citizens were even forced to buy titles of nobility, Philippson, *Westeuropa im Zeitalter von Philipp II, Elisabeth und Heinrich IV*, 1882, p. 285.

⁴⁴ K. Schneider in his *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 1924, p. 175.

⁴⁵ Martin, p. 679; Feist, p. 97; Luschan, *Zusammenhänge und Konvergenz*, 1918, p. 79.

⁴⁶ It is just as mistaken to assume, as Houston Stewart Chamberlain often does, that the Semites never effected anything cultural, for everything could be traced back to Egyptian or Sumerian influence; one might on such a logical basis contest that the Teutons ever performed anything for their culture is closely connected with the ancient world and the Bible and for a thousand years they used chiefly Latin and French for all higher intellectual performances. On the Sumerian question cf. Winckler, *Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens*, 1892, pp. 22, 52, 56; further F. Hommel, *Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens*, 1885, p. 237.

⁴⁷ Cf. further Spengler, *Untergang des Abendlandes*, 2 vols., 1922, p. 199.

⁴⁸ Vide Professor Georg Beer, *Die Bedeutung des Arierthums für die israelitische Kultur* (Lecture delivered at the University of Heidelberg), 1922.

⁴⁹ O. Munsterberg, *Gibt es eine autochthone chinesische Kunst?* *Korrbl.*, 1914, pp. 40 et seq.

⁵⁰ Thurnwald, "Psychologie des primitiven Menschen," 1923 (*Handb. d. vergl. Psychologie*), pp. 243-65.

⁵¹ In the quite isolated Easter Island many tables with long inscriptions were found, which go back to the black Melanesians who formerly ruled there.